THE COMMUNIST

Vol. XII JULY, 1933 No. 7

Copy H
M. W. Gilbert
SURPLUS DUPLICATE

FROM THE CONTENTS

The World Economic Conference . *Peter Bolm*

American Imperialism Prepares for War *Robert W. Dunn*

War in the Far East and Our Tasks . *K. Kita*

Unity in the Struggle for Social Insurance *I. Amter*

Imperialism and the Split in Socialism *V. I. Lenin*

The Intensification of the Versailles Antagonisms and the Menace of a New Imperialist War . . . . . *N. Rudolph*

The Veterans and the United Front . *E. Levin*

The Soviet Union Fight for Peace . *A. A. Heller*

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ANOTHER MARXIAN CLASSIC

In Enlarged and Revised Edition

GERMANY: REVOLUTION AND COUNTER-REVOLUTION

By FRIEDRICH ENGELS

The famous articles on the German Revolution, formerly accredited to Marx, appearing in the *New York Daily Tribune*. In a new and enlarged edition, with copious explanatory notes, Engels' "History of the Communist League" and important addresses of its Central Committee to the workers of Germany.

Cloth $1.50; Paper $.60

Already Published in this series: *Communist Manifesto*, 10c; *Wage-Labor and Capital*, 10c; *The Civil War in France*, 25c; *The Critique of the Gotha Programme*, 50c.

•

Two New "International" *Books*

About the old and the new Ruusia:

BRIEF HISTORY OF RUSSIA

Volume I

By M. N. POKROVSKY

The classic Marxist interpretation of Russian history from earliest times to the rise of capitalism. The author re-writes his larger *History of Russia* in concise and popular form and clarifies the background of the Russian Revolution.

$2.00

•

ON GUARD FOR THE SOVIET UNION

By MAXIM GORKY

Introduction by ROMAIN ROLAND

The father and chief "shock-worker" of proletarian literature rises to the defense of the Soviet Union, explains the importance of its achievements, and discusses problems of proletarian culture.

Cloth $1.50; Boards $.75

•

Order from

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Sta. D., New York City

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE COMMUNIST

A Magazine of the Theory and Practice of Marxism-Leninism

Published Monthly by the

Communist Party of the United States of America

Entered as second class matter November 2, 1927, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1879. 209

Vol. XII. JULY, 1933 No. 7

CONTENTS

THE WORLD ECONOMIC CONFERENCE 611
By PETER BOLM

AMERICAN IMPERIALISM PREPARES FOR WAR 625
By ROBERT W. DUNN

WAR IN THE FAR EAST AND OUR TASKS 636
By K. KITA

UNITY IN THE STRUGGLE FOR SOCIAL INSURANCE 650
By I. AMTER

IMPERIALISM AND THE SPLIT IN SOCIALISM 659
By V. I. LENIN

THE INTENSIFICATION OF THE VERSAILLES ANTAGONISMS AND THE MENACE OF A NEW IMPERIALIST WAR 670
By N. RUDOLPH

THE VETERANS AND THE UNITED FRONT 684
By E. LEVIN

THE SOVIET UNION FIGHTS FOR PEACE 696
By A. A. HELLER

Make all checks, money orders, and correspondence to: THE COMMUNIST, P. O. Box 148, Station D (50 East 13th Street), New York. Subscription rates: $2.00 a year; $1.00 for six months; foreign and Canada $2.50 a year. Single copies 20 cents.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Literature for August First

FOR SPECIAL WIDESPREAD DISTRIBUTION

TWO LENIN PAMPHLETS ON WAR:

SOCIALISM AND WAR

15 CENTS

and

THE WAR AND THE SECOND INTERNATIONAL

20 CENTS

also

The Struggle Against Imperialist War and the Tasks of the Communists

Resolution of the Sixth World Congress of the Communist International

15 CENTS

Other Pamphlets

THE SOVIET'S FIGHT FOR DISARMAMENT: The Soviet proposals for peace and disarmament at the Geneva Disarmament Conference 15c

THE WORLD CONGRESS AGAINST WAR 5c

JAPAN IN MANCHURIA—*S. Dashinsky* 10c

AN EYE-WITNESS IN MANCHURIA—*W. M. Holmes* 15c

JAPANESE IMPERIALISM STRIPPED—The Secret Memorandum of Tanaka, Premier of Japan 5c

WAR IN THE FAR EAST—*Henry Hall* 10c

WAR IN CHINA—*Ray Stewart* 10c

YANKEE COLONIES—*Harry Gannes* 10c

CHEMICAL WARFARE—*Donald Cameron* 10c

Two Books of Special Importance

THE IMPERIALIST WAR

By V. I. LENIN

Analysis of the World War and the policy to be followed by the revolutionary workers in the struggle against war and capitalism.

$3.50

THE SOVIET UNION AND PEACE

Introduction by Henri Barbusse

A complete record of the efforts of the Soviet Government to obtain peace and disarmament from its very inception. Indispensable to an understanding of the Soviet policy on peace.

$1.75

Order from

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Sta., D, (50 East 13th St.) New York City

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The World Economic Conference

By PETER BOLM

I.

AT the Lausanne Reparations Conference held in July, 1932, it was suggested that a world conference on economic and monetary problems be called to "solve" the problems of capitalism in crisis. A preparatory commission of experts was set up by the League of Nations to write the conference agenda. This committee began its work in October and issued its report in January of this year. The crisis was already three and a half years old when Roosevelt was inaugurated and all the United States banks closed their doors. The New Deal had arrived in America, and soon showed itself as a policy of wage, pension and benefit cuts, and of an aggressive attack by every method of economic warfare backed up by vigorous military and naval construction against the rivals of American capitalism for a larger share in world markets. The new commercial foreign policy of "attack" was made manifest in Roosevelt's call for a tariff truce, and, more sensationally, by the departure of the United States from the gold standard, excellently stage-managed by the impresario in the White House to take place exactly at the moment when the British Premier and French plenipotentiary were in mid-Atlantic on their way to the Washington conversations.

The signature of the tariff truce, naturally with sufficient reservations, was the signal for an outbreak of economic nationalism. England rushed in to sign bilateral trade agreements with Argentina, Germany, Norway, Sweden and Denmark. The London *Economist* itself stated that the Argentinian agreement would be regarded in Washington as an "aggressive measure directed against American interests." (May 6.) And the *Observer* (independent Conservative) pointed out that the haste with which "Britain is consolidating its position by concluding bilateral treaties continues to arouse resentment." The devaluation of the dollar by 18 per cent was a severe blow to America's trade rivals. England answered within a few days by jumping her Exchange Equalization Account from 175 to 375 million pounds. This account is used in such a way as to manipulate the foreign exchanges so as to depress the pound sterling in terms of the dollar, thus attempting to

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

preserve to Great Britain the differential advantage in finding markets for her exports that she derived from her "cheap money."

With the opening of a new and higher stage in the struggle between the pound and the dollar, with the multiplication of bilateral and regional commercial agreements, with the imposition of new trade embargoes and import prohibitions, with a general raising of tariffs and the universal development of "trade war" conditions —the plans for the World Monetary and Economic Conference in London were pushed along.

II.

The London Conference comes five years after the first World Economic Conference, which was held in Geneva in May, 1927. The period that has elapsed between the two conferences corresponds roughly to the period of the Soviet Union's first Five Year Plan. The two balance sheets present strikingly different results.

The index of production (1928 = 100) in 1932 stood as follows:

U.S.S.R.	218.5
Capitalist countries	67
United States	57
Great Britain	89
Germany	57
France	74

Comrade Stalin, more than three years ago, only a few months after the New York Stock Exchange crash that heralded the present crisis, gave a very clear picture of the situation. Speaking of the period between the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Party Congresses of the C. P. S. U., he said:

> "To characterize this period in a few words, we might call it the *turn of the tide*. The tide turned not only for us in the U.S.S.R. but also for the capitalist countries of the whole world. But there is a radical difference between these two turns. While the turn for the U.S.S.R. meant a turn towards a new and more important economic *advance*, for the capitalist countries it meant a turn towards economic *decline*. In the U.S.S.R. there is *increasing progress* in Socialist construction, both in industry and in agriculture. In the capitalist countries there is a *growing* economic crisis, both in industry and in agriculture." (*Stalin: Political Report to the Sixteenth Party Congress, C. P. S. U.*)

During the three years that followed this speech, the growing crisis of capitalism has assumed catastrophic proportions. *The basic question that faces the capitalist powers is still the question of markets.* But the conditions in which this problem is faced today are very different from those that existed in 1927. Industrial output has fallen heavily. This decline is the more marked in those

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

branches producing capital equipment. Industries are in general operating at only a fraction of capacity. The value of the total foreign trade of the world has fallen by two-thirds since 1929. World reserves of agricultural products and raw materials continue to pile up. The index of reserves is now more than two times the 1925 figure. This heaping up of unsaleable surpluses has taken place in spite of government enforced reductions in areas of cultivation, and in spite of wholesale destruction of stocks by burning, spoiling, etc. Only a small minority of capitalist countries are at present maintaining themselves precariously on the gold standard. Two-thirds of the sixty odd countries represented at the London Conference have been forced to introduce restrictions on the movement of their currencies. The prices of raw materials have dropped by from one half to two-thirds. National incomes have declined in every capitalist country, and the declines have in most cases produced heavy budget deficits. The diminution in international trade plus the drop in commodity prices and the widespread disorganization of currencies, have greatly intensified the problems of inter-governmental debts and caused many *de facto* repudiations even of private debts. The total value of the exports of some countries is insufficient to carry the service on its foreign debts alone. Even the International Labor Office sets officially the world unemployment figures at 30,000,000. This picture of the world five years after the Geneva Economic Conference may be aptly concluded by a quotation from the experts' report prepared for the London Conference:

> "In the sphere of international trade, prohibitions, quotas, discount agreements, and tariff limitations—if we speak only of the widespread forms of regulation—are strangling economic activity and private initiative. These measures which are being taken with the aim of defense and in many cases are compulsory owing to the dislocation of the currency and extraordinary financial difficulties, *have developed to the state of actual economic war.*"

Such is the economic setting of the Conference. The tangle of imperialist conflicts, ever unstilled even in "normal" times, has been made dramatic at London. The microcosm in London of the world economic macrocosm gives us a vivid picture of the internecine struggle between the imperialist powers, especially the clash of the United States with Great Britain along the whole economic front in frenzied struggle for markets, and also of the greater conflict of two worlds, that of convulsively declining capitalism, and that of growing and strengthening Socialism.

III.

To monopolize completely the domestic market, to obtain pos-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

session of new markets for the export of goods and capital, to secure new sources of raw materials,—these are the aims of each imperialist power. This constant struggle to consolidate old markets and reach out for new ones takes place today, however, under conditions of extreme crisis in which the world market as a whole is continuously shrinking. We therefore have the following conditions: 1) a continuous decrease in international trade; 2) consequently an intensified struggle on the part of the imperialists to better their respective shares in this declining volume of trade, leading 3) to the general adoption of measures of economic warfare which in their turn accelerate the decline in international trade and thus 4) bring the imperialist powers face to face with a situation in which the only possible way out that remains for them is to attempt to carve out a new division of markets with the sword.

Let us take some of these points in turn. The total value of international trade was $61,625,000,000 in 1928. In the "prosperity year" 1929 this figure rose to $68,290,999,000. By 1932 the value of international trade had dropped to $26,160,000,000 —roughly 38 per cent of the 1929 level. Calculating the 1933 figure on the basis of the trade statistics of the first few months alone, we find a further decline to 33.3 per cent.

The table below shows the percentage year by year enjoyed by the great imperialist powers in this declining total.

	1928	1929	1930	1931	1932
England	14.8	14.8	15.2	15.4	15.4
Germany	10.6	10.6	11.0	11.1	10.7
Italy	3.6	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.4
United States	15.4	15.7	13.9	12.7	12.4
France	7.0	7.0	7.6	8.2	8.4
Japan	3.2	3.3	3.0	3.3	3.3

These figures show that England's devaluation of the pound, the consolidation of the British Empire markets as a result of the Ottawa agreements, and her adoption of a system of protective tariffs, have enabled her to maintain and even slightly improve her share of the world's declining international trade. The United States, with its drop from 15.7% in 1929 to 12.4% last year, has fallen behind Great Britain and now takes second place. France, with an aggressive tariff policy of bilateral agreements and with her recent avoidance of most-favored-nation treaty clauses, has also improved her relative position. France, following the example of Britain, has also aimed at a "closed" French Empire, and part of her improved trade position is explained by the fact that trade with her colonies, which in 1925 accounted for 18 per cent of her total trade, now amounts to 29 per cent of the total. Japan has not been able to lean economically on a more vigorous exploitation of colonial

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

possessions, and has been forced the earlier to take to the path of predatory war. She has carved for herself out of China a colony of 40-45 million inhabitants. Not content with this, she is penetrating further south into China toward the Yangtse Valley, and northwest toward Mongolia and the Soviet Union. In addition she has devaluated her money 60 per cent, in a violent attempt to capture the British-Indian and Malayan markets, in order to counterbalance the drastic decline in her trade with China. Japan's share in the foreign trade of China has dropped from 28 to 16 per cent—in the main the result of the boycott. It is significant that at the same time the share of the United States has risen in almost precisely the same proportion—from 16 to 29 per cent.

In this maze of imperialist contradictions, the guiding clue must be sought in the reversed position of Great Britain and the United States, in the determination of the United States to regain the ground she has lost to England, and in the no less strong determination of England to maintain her position and even advance it.

With the gradual strangulation of international trade the methods of trade warfare have reached new heights of destructive efficiency. The fight for markets is now carried on with a whole new armory of economic weapons—quota restrictions on imports, monetary devaluation and retaliatory surtaxes against currency dumping, prohibitions and restrictions on the export of capital, export licensing requirements, partial or total trade embargoes—as well as with all the old ones, such as tariffs, shipping subsidies, export bounties and the like.

IV.

Out of these conditions of economic crisis and economic war comes the London Conference. It is to be a "peace conference." Its agenda is one of "economic disarmament." This "central planning commission" of capitalism is to "bring order out of chaos." How was the Conference prepared for?

America's preparation included abandonment of the gold standard, repudiation of gold payments, the break-up of the Lausanne agreements through an inflexible refusal to consider either a temporary moratorium or a scaling down of the debts due her from the European countries, a bold bid for world leadership through the Roosevelt "peace" message and Davis's demagogic displays at the Geneva Disarmament Conference masking the laying down of 32 new battleships and 290 airplanes, and the famous "tariff truce," which was designed to check increases in the tariff systems of America's rivals while at the same time perpetuating the already high tariffs of the United States.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

England's preparations included the manipulation of the Exchange Equalization Fund against the U. S., the signing of separate trade treaties wherever possible, a financial *rapprochement* with France in the form of a 30,000,000 pound loan to the French Treasury (which, it was rumored, was made in return for a French promise that the 15% special tariff against British imports imposed after the devaluation of the pound would be abrogated), embargoes against Ireland and the Soviet Union, denunciation of India's trade treaty with Japan and withdrawal of the British West African colonies from the scope of the Anglo-Japanese trade pact.

France actually on June 10, two days before the Conference opened, deposited two bills in the Chamber of Deputies with the signed sponsorship of President Lebrun, Premier Daladier and five Cabinet members, which gave the French government powers to impose special surtaxes by decree on imports from countries which have inflated currencies, and to raise tariffs without consulting parliament.

Germany, though the abolition of shipping subsidies was on the Conference agenda, voted subsidies of 20,000,000 marks to her shipping lines on May 27. She also came to the Conference armed with a transfer moratorium on all public and private, long term and short term debts. The moratorium was declared June 8, to become effective July 1. This weighty bargaining argument had been carefully planned for. Already in mid-April the repayment of a 14,000,000 pound loan in gold to the Bank of England and to other central banks had reduced the gold coverage of the German currency from 23 to 15 per cent. According to the weekly return of the Reichsbank on June 2, it was then down to 7.5 per cent. In Dr. Schacht's statement less than a week later it was revealed that the Reichsbank holdings of gold and eligible bills had decreased from 3,078,000,000 marks in June 1930 to 280,000,000 in May, 1933. The effectiveness of the moratorium as a weapon at London can be seen from the fact that it suspends interest charges and amortization on 17,300,000,000 marks ($4,824,000,000). Of this sum, the United States holds two-fifths.

The two or three weeks immediately preceding the Conference saw a burst of activity, not only from the great powers, but also from the small ones. On June 6, the Turkish government made heavy increases in nearly all tariffs. The increases went into effect retroactively on May 31, no warning given, and Turkey's foreign trade was temporarily paralyzed. On June 7, Rumania served notice on the oil conference that as the United States had been exceeding her agreed daily quota of 2,000,000 by over half a million barrels a day, she would have to discontinue her collabora-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion and look to her own interests. On June 11 Poland prohibited completely the importation of oil, seed, wool, tanning and chemical products, fats, linen, cloth, shoes, and some other commodities, from the United States, Argentina, South Africa and Australia. A few days earlier a Conference had closed at Bukharest at which ten central European agricultural states, with a population of over one hundred millions, had been represented. Poland, the Little Entente, Hungary, some of the small Baltic republics, Turkey and Greece, issued a joint declaration threatening common moratorium action on their debts, refusing to reduce their sown areas under grain, demanding preferential treatment for European grain in the European markets, pronouncing against most-favored-nation treaties, and looking to a closed regional system of preferential tariffs unless their demands were met at London. This central European bloc owes the United States more than $500,000,000, much of which is in default.

These were some of the special preparations for the Conference that was to carry through "economic disarmament." The London *Daily Worker* was certainly correct in describing the Conference as "a thieves' kitchen."

V.

The statements of the arriving delegates were not such as to lighten the prevailing atmosphere of pessimism. We are living under conditions of "bitter economic warfare," said Secretary of State Cordell Hull in an interview granted while on his way to the Conference. Great Britain "will wage unflinching trade war" against her rivals, declared Sir Neville Chamberlain, the British Chancellor of the Exchequer. Henri Queuille, French Minister of Agriculture, speaking at Rodez the day before the Conference opened, said, "I go to London to *defend* French agriculture." All the delegates were arriving with arms in their hands for the "harmony" discussions. Senator Couzens on his way to London said that he was "hopeful rather than optimistic." He added that if the Conference could not satisfy the demands of the United States, he would "return as a rabid isolationist." In the event of failure at London, he added, "*it will be up to us to protect ourselves without regard for other nations.*" Moley, in an article written just before the Conference opened, warned that "only moderate results must be anticipated." "It would serve no useful purpose," he said, "to lead people to feel that the world is going to be transfigured by the Conference."

Such were the statements of responsible leaders of the three greatest capitalist powers represented at the Conference—and be-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

hind the diplomatic (sometimes not so diplomatic) phrase, was the veiled (even hardly veiled) threat. The last-ditch defense of domestic markets, *from* their rivals, the demand for a share in the markets *of* their rivals, and the threat of "isolationist policy"—i.e., high tariffs at home plus an aggressive currency policy abroad—these were the programs that the warring monopoly capitalisms took with them to London.

VI.

It was in an atmosphere thick with these contingent threats of economic nationalism that the Conference finally began its sessions. Immediately the expected head-on clash between the United States and Great Britain developed on the three fundamental issues of the Conference—debts, tariffs, and currency stabilization.

The debt payments, which fell due on June 15, three days after the opening of the Conference, were defaulted totally or partially by every European country (except Finland). By a 10 per cent "token" payment in silver England was allowed to escape technical default.

On the question of tariffs, the position of both rivals was to obtain reductions in the tariffs which confront their exportable goods, but at the same time to avoid reducing their own protective barriers. Moley had pointed out that tariffs are "deeply rooted in the policies of the various countries and are *closely integrated parts* of their economic life. All of the nations, including our own, have been moving toward self-support for a long time." Sir Arthur Salter, the British economic expert, also expressed himself cautiously on the subject of tariffs. "We are cherishing illusions," he said, "if we think that the Conference can itself, during its own sessions, substantially negotiate away these *old-established tariffs to which the economy of the countries concerned has become adapted.*"

From these quotations we can sufficiently see that neither the United States nor Great Britain had any intention of lowering tariffs. Tariffs are too "integrate" with the capitalist economy; the economic structure is too "adapted" to the tariff systems—and so on and so forth. For tariffs are, in truth, the heavy artillery of the economic armed forces of the State, and this "disarmament conference," like others before it, despite its pacifist chatter, moves rather to perfect its economic war apparatus, looking ahead to the inevitably approaching transformation of economic into open military warfare for the redistribution of markets.

A tariff system is, in the present imperialist period, an essential part of the economic structure of a capitalist country. It is the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

means by which national monopoly capitalism not only secures its domestic market for itself, but establishes a firm base for its aggressive operations in the field of foreign trade. Especially for the United States, with a domestic market of 125,000,000 people, its tariff system—the highest in the world—is the economic guarantee for the forward policy of "attack" which the Roosevelt government is pursuing in its endeavor to hack and hew a path into foreign markets for America's exportable commodities.

Tariff policies are conditioned by the ever-present imperialist struggle for markets. *High tariffs at home are complementary to the dumping of goods abroad.* The tariff is an economic *weapon* and to talk about "reduction" and "economic disarmament" is to ignore the brute fact of trade war and the fight for markets.

The question of tariffs at London was complicated by the clash of currencies and the uncertain fluctuations of the foreign exchanges. A tariff is adjusted to meet the competition of goods produced abroad under certain more or less fixed price conditions. With continually changing foreign exchange rates a tariff (unless it is adjusted to meet every change in the value of the foreign currency) will not be able to carry out adequately the purposes for which it was devised. It was precisely for this reason, to counteract the effect of English monetary depreciation and French tariffs and the like, that the United States abandoned gold and began a competitive race in inflationary depreciation. To quote from President Roosevelt, on the occasion of the government's assumption of the necessary inflationary powers:

> "Without such powers, it would have been almost impossible to accomplish promptly the ends which most of our citizens have in view, namely, assuring American merchants and shippers equality of opportunity with competitors in world business."

Stabilization consequently became the prime question facing the Conference. American dollar depreciation, an aggressive move of American capital interests against its foreign trade rivals, and at the same time an index of the weakness of the capitalist system in general, and of American capitalism in particular, represents a desperate attempt at remedying a desperate situation. And it was precisely the irreconcilable antagonisms which underlie this question of stabilization that finally, after some three weeks, succeeded in essentially breaking up the Conference.

Federal Reserve dollar selling and the operations of the Exchange Equalization Fund had been rocking the foreign exchanges violently in the period immediately previous to the meetings of the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Conference. The "Gold Bloc," which formed rapidly under the impact of the wild currency fluctuations of the dollar and pound, and included France, Italy, Belgium, Holland and Switzerland, immediately took the position that no tariff questions could be discussed until the American and English currencies were pegged to the franc. Meetings of the Central Bank representatives of the great powers made no progress toward achieving stabilization of currencies for the very good reason that the United States was prepared to block any such move even at the expense of wrecking the Conference. English efforts were directed toward preserving the *status quo* and preventing any further depreciation of the dollar. Part of the differential trade advantage that she had acquired through her own departure from gold had been wiped out by the action of the Roosevelt administration in inflating the currency, but England was prepared to lose a part if by so doing she could avoid losing the whole. The United States, which had begun by insisting that the debt question should be barred from the Conference agenda, now laid down that stabilization was a "minor issue" and that it was not the province of the Conference, but rather that of the international bankers, to discuss this matter. The final reply of American monopoly capitalism to the threats of the gold bloc and to English trade competition was the President's message to the Conference (July 3) and the simultaneous drop of the dollar on the foreign exchange market, first to $4.43, and later to $4.52 to the pound.

VII.

The pound had at one time dropped as low as to be worth only $3.20. But now the differential advantage of Great Britain (the par rate of exchange being $4.86) was being wiped out with a vengeance, and the dollar, after a few weeks of the "Economic Disarmament Conference," had only another 36 cents to fall in order to get rid of that advantage altogether.

This struggle between the pound and the dollar, which is the struggle between England and the United States, was the decisive antagonism in the camp of the imperialists at London under the tremendous strain of which the Conference broke.

But the World Economic Conference also brought out the blazing contrast between the two worlds of capitalism and Socialism. Comrade Litvinov's speech at the Conference was not only a Socialist challenge to the decaying capitalist system—it was a call to the working class of the world to follow the proletariat of the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Soviet Union in taking the revolutionary way out of the crisis towards planned Socialist economy.

How different the position of the Soviet delegation at this Conference and at the early post-war conferences. At London, the Soviet Union stood out as an oasis of sanity and progress encircled by the capitalist world of insane starvation amidst plenty—capitalist world with only the prospective of war before it.

At a time when every capitalist country is raising tariffs against the impacts of its neighbor, the Soviet Union, on the contrary, listed the commodities its industry was prepared to absorb. Litvinov told a speechless Conference that the Soviet Union will, in the immediate future, be able to absorb the following commodities.

$100,000,000	worth of aluminum, nickel, copper, lead, etc.
$200,000,000	worth of iron and steel.
$100,000,000	worth of raw materials for the textile, leather and rubber industries.
$400,000,000	worth of machinery, including railroad materials to the value of $100,000,000 alone.
$ 35,000,000	worth of agricultural goods, and of cattle, etc.
$ 50,000,000	worth of food products, such as tea, cocoa, coffee, herrings, etc.
$ 50,000,000	worth of ships, mainly for industrial purposes, fishing, etc.

The Foreign Commissar of the Soviet Union then turned to the question of the obstacles that are placed in the way of international trade by all of the capitalist countries. He described realistically the actual conditions of economic war which prevail throughout the world. To talk of tariff truce, he said, was an implied admission that a state of war existed. A truce was not merely the abstention from further aggression, but a discontinuance of present hostilities. Just as the Soviet Union, steadfast in its peace policy, has been the only country to make concrete proposals for a disarmament that went beyond mere words, at the international Disarmament Conferences, so the Soviet Union, in the speech of Comrade Litvinov, proposed concrete steps to the London Conference for the cessation of economic hostilities. These concrete proposals, just as they have time and again exposed the shallow hypocrisy of the capitalist "pacifists" in Geneva, expose the hypocrisy of the capitalist shouts for "economic disarmament" at London.

Why is the Soviet Union able to put forward such a policy? It is because the Soviet Union is a Socialist country that has done

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

away with exploitation, and which consequently is not driven by the whip of private profit to the search for foreign markets. The planned economy of the Soviet Union, planned in the interests of all the workers and peasants, balances the purchasing power of the people and the investments for internal improvements for the future with the whole product of its industry. The people of the Soviet Union work for themselves and for their children, not to provide for a minority of property owners. The people of the Soviet Union, because they are building Socialism, not only have nothing in common with imperialist subjection of the colonies, but actively aid the anti-imperialist struggles of the oppressed colonial peoples.

VIII.

How are we to cast up a balance sheet of this London Economic Conference? What has been accomplished? Only a sharpening of the contradictions already present before the conference. Only the concentration to a focal point of the main inter-imperialist conflict—that between England and the United States for primacy in the world market.

The struggle for markets between the imperialist powers was transferred for three weeks to the Geological Museum in London. While the foreign exchanges strained under the assaults and counter-attacks of currencies in the race of competitive depreciation, the diplomats gathered around the committee tables and tried for a while to obtain by threat and counter-threat the marketing advantages and new "spheres of influence" which they will soon be seeking to obtain with the weapons of military warfare. The threats will soon have to be made good with marching armies, the detonation of high explosives, the movement of navies and the flight of air squadrons.

The aggressive imperialist role of American monopoly capitalism has been shown with transparent clearness. The United States at the Conference began by ruling out the subject of debts, went on to reject categorically any halting of its dollar depreciation program through measures of stabilization, and has ended by urging that the Conference be "disbanded" and by stating that no tariff reductions need be expected from America.

With the violent disruption of the Conference by the intensity of the imperialist antagonisms, the capitalist world will proceed without a halt to more vicious forms of economic warfare which will continue unabated until they develop inevitably into the open

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

form of military conflict. That this conflict is impending there can be no doubt. To quote the *Annalist* (March 17):

> "European war in the very near future can hardly be denied recognition. . . . We were lifted from a business depression in 1914 by the outbreak of a great war. It would be a curious repetition if another European war should again come to our rescue."

The *Annalist* presumably has in mind a "European" war like that of 1914-1918, in which both America and Japan played a part, and which was fought on all five continents and seven seas.

And for the very reason that the danger of imperialist war is so great, precisely because the antagonisms between the imperialist powers have reached such a degree of intensity, the danger today of imperialist intervention against the Soviet Union is greater than ever.

During the very sessions of the Economic Conference, the German fascist government offered itself to the great powers as an instrument for intervention against the Soviet Union. The Hugenberg Memorandum suggested the territory of the U.S.S.R. as a suitable field for German colonial expansion. To attempt to solve temporarily the problems of the capitalist world by blood transfusion from the Soviet Union, to try to cut the Gordian knot of Versailles treaty revision by carving territory out of the living body of the Soviet Union, to overthrow the Soviet power and bring the people of the U.S.S.R. into the orbit of capitalist exploitation—these aims of the imperialist powers become clearer as their difficulties develop and the antagonisms become more pressing.

The problem of London was the problem of markets. The conflicts were conflicts for markets. The rivalry in currency depreciation was a struggle for commercial advantage in the fight for markets. This fight for new Empires, this fight to divide the colonial countries anew, will be transferred from the Conference chamber back again to the world outside.

The perspective for the immediate future, after the collapse in ruins of the London Conference, remains that which Comrade Stalin pointed out in December, 1927, after the inglorious Geneva Conference had ended. Comrade Stalin said:

> "The economic conference of the League of Nations in 1927, which had the aim of uniting the economic interests of the capitalist countries, broke down. The peaceful path for solving the problems of markets is closed for capitalism. There remains the only 'way out' for capitalism: a new redivision of colonies and

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

spheres of influence by new imperialist wars." (*Questions of Leninism.*)

In 1933, as in 1927, the only "way out" for capitalism will be through war. But since 1927, conditions have enormously changed. The crisis has grown and developed. The danger of war is greater, and nearer.

"The present war is of an imperialist character. This war is the outcome of the conditions of an epoch when capitalism has reached the highest stage of its development; when the greatest significance is attached not only to the export of commodities, but also to the export of capital; when the combination of production units in cartels, and the internationalization of economic life, has assumed considerable dimensions; when colonial politics have brought about an almost total apportionment of the globe among the colonial powers; when the productive forces of world capitalism have outgrown the limited boundaries of national and state divisions, when objective conditions for the realization of Socialsm have perfectly ripened."—Lenin.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

American Imperialism Prepares for War

By ROBERT W. DUNN

THE government of the United States is preparing for war. In spite of interminable disarmament conferences that do not disarm, in spite of security pacts, consultative pacts, four-power treaties, Locarno agreements, League covenants, naval conferences international boycotts and sanctions, and all the rest of the stage business of imperialism, comically described as "peace machinery", preparations for the next war continue unabated. Why this is so and the basic forces leading to another world-wide slaughter are dealt with in other articles. It is the purpose of this article merely to sketch a few of the preparations for battle now being carried on by that government which likes to be regarded as the guardian and apostle of international peace—the government of Wall Street.

This government is clearly making preparations not only for the defence of its territory on this continent. It is preparing to protect "life and property" abroad, its "commerce on the high seas", its "sovereign rights", its "certain foreign policies", to use the varying phrases of its spokesmen. It is seeking "the protection and promotion of national policies" (War Department Manual) and to "support American interests, especially the expansion and development of American foreign commerce," (S. P. Fullinwider, Commander, United States Navy). In other words it is preparing not to defend the "homeland" so much as to protect Wall Street interests everywhere in the world and to extend its foreign markets, investments and other sources of profits. This means American rubber plantations in Malaya or Liberia, railroads in Cuba, tin in Bolivia, oil in Mexico and Colombia, power plants in China and Guatamala, diamond mines in Africa, fruit plantations in Costa Rica, sugar mills in Hawaii and a hundred other stakes of imperialism which have been acquired largely since the last World War. The preparations of the United States are made in order to acquire new interests and holdings abroad as well as to protect the loot already gathered in those parts of the world where super-profits are obtainable from the exploitation of the peasants and workers.

PREPARING THE WAR FLEET

That the overseas interests of Wall Street are dominant in the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

minds of the government is indicated by the great importance of the navy in the plans for war preparations, and the expenditures for it which run as follows during recent fiscal years: (Expenses for the army are given in the same table to show the relative amounts for this branch of the war machine.)

EXPENDITURES FOR NATIONAL "DEFENSE"*
(in millions of dollars)

	1926-27	1927-28	1928-29	1929-30
Army	267.3	293.2	312.1	327.3
Navy	324.2	332.2	366.1	375.4
	1930-31	1931-32	1932-33	1933-34
Army	345.2	345.0	305.7	278.6**
Navy	382.5	354.0	328.9	309.6**

* Figures of Foreign Policy Association based on U. S. Treasury reports.

**Treasury Department estimates increased, at least in case of the Navy Department to a minimum of $400,000,000, by new appropriations made by special session of Congress. (See text below.)

The navy is to receive particular attention under the Roosevelt administration. Roosevelt, having been Assistant Secretary of Navy under war chief Woodrow Wilson, has a special enthusiasm for this branch of the nation's armaments, which are built for aggression in the bitter struggles for trade and colonial control. Roosevelt is for an "adequate Navy" capable of taking care of all the Wall Street interests abroad. Secretary of the Navy Swanson, after his appointment by Roosevelt, advocated building the navy up to the maximum permitted by the London treaty. He urged the building by December 31, 1936, of 287,330 tons of combatant shipping at a cost estimated by naval officers at $1,000,000,000 and including at least 119 vessels: 89 destroyers, 20 submarines, seven light cruisers and three aircraft carriers. (*New York Times*, March 8, 1933.)

The first step in this program was taken when it was announced early in June, (1933) that 32 new fighting ships, costing $238,020,000, would be added to the fleet within the next three years under the latest plans of the Secretary of the Navy. These are in addition to the 17 now under construction. The new 32 include:

1. Four 10,000-ton cruisers with 15 six-inch guns.
2. Twenty destroyers: 4 of the 1,850 ton type and 16 of 1,500 tons displacement. (The United States already has 251 destroyers.)
3. Two airplane carriers of 15,000 tons.
4. Four submarines of 1,400 tons.
5. Two river gunboats of 2,000 tons—the latter intend-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ed for use against the Chinese peasants and workers as are other U. S. gunboats in Chinese waters.

This action is taken under the Public Works section of the National Industrial Recovery Act, the move being awkwardly justified as giving more employment to labor. It will undoubtedly mean profit increases for Bethlehem Steel Corp., Midvale Co. (Baldwin Locomotive Works) and Carnegie Steel Co. (U. S. Steel) which recently received large armor plate orders from the Navy Department (*Wall Street Journal,* June 23, 1933.) The complete "consistency" of this program with the demagogic peace proclamations of Roosevelt was indicated when it was first announced. Chairman Vinson of the House Naval Committee stated, in the words of the *New York Times* (May 19, 1933), that "the proposed building program was in full harmony with President Roosevelt's message to the heads of fifty-four nations, advocating disarmament and complete elimination of weapons of offensive warfare."

In connection with the announcements of the expanded naval program the pro-administration foreign editor of the Scripps-Howard Newspaper Alliance wrote: "Unless the rest of the world agrees to cut down its armament the United States will arm." He gave no indication that the other imperialist powers would be inclined to take any steps toward reductions. Japan, on the other hand, for example, is pressing for a navy as great as that of Great Britain or the United States.

SWANSON'S CHALLENGE TO THE WORLD

On June 29, the very day that the World Disarmament Conference "adjourned" for the summer, Secretary Swanson shot his latest and most bellicose bolt in one of the most provocative statements issued by a Secretary of the Navy since the armistice in 1918.

In announcing what was referred to as a new general naval policy—actually it is but a continuation of the old one—he outlined the preparations program on all fronts. "To create, maintain and operate a navy second to none," "to support American interests especially the development of American foreign commerce and the merchant marine," "to encourage civil industries and activities useful in war," "to further the development of the outlying bases in the Hawaiian Islands and the Canal Zone," "to cooperate with American commercial communication activities so as to enhance their military value in time of national emergency and to safeguard the communications interests of the United States," (Radio Corp., Western Union, and other companies), "to povide protection against espionage and propaganda"—these were some of the varied sundry

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

scores of purposes set forth in the Swanson message which was aimed chiefly at British and Japanese imperialism.

One of the most important parts of the statement dealt with the development of four main home naval bases, two on the Atlantic and two on the Pacific Coast. In the meantime the whole United States fleet remains stationed in the Pacific with Los Angeles also scheduled to be developed as a base capable of handling the entire fleet.

It is certain that with the support of Roosevelt, always a Big Navy advocate, the full program of Secretary Swanson and the Wall Street imperialists will go through. The breakdown of the disarmament conference and the failure of the economic conference in London will be the signal for speeding up this program, and we may expect to see the next Congress grinding out additional appropriations for the navy.

MERCHANT SHIPS AND THE WAR PROGRAM

But the actual warships are not the only instruments in United States naval preparations. Commercial ships, used in the sharpening trade rivalry between the United States and other imperialist nations, can also be used in time of war, and are now being prepared for that very purpose. Every vessel built under the Jones-White Law of 1928, and this includes nearly every ship built since that date, is so constructed as to be immediately convertible into a naval auxiliary in time of war. All ships built under this act must have their plans approved by the Navy Department as to their suitability for use as a naval auxiliary. And vessels rebuilt or reconditioned under the Act are required to have their decks specially reenforced to bear the weight of guns. Officers working on these ships serve without pay as members of the U. S. Naval Reserve.

Ships built before 1928 are, of course, also included in the war program. The United States merchant fleet was built up chiefly during the World War, being constructed by the United States Shipping Board for the transport of troops, munitions and food to the war area in Europe. Those that remain in condition will be used for the same purpose in the next war. They can also be converted, naval experts agree, into aircraft carriers.

AIRCRAFT PREPARATIONS

The aircraft industry and airlines of the United States are also increasingly important in the current war preparations. Air mail subsidies to private lines have been used to stimulate the development of aviation to function as part of the war machine. The War

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Department does everything possible to encourage this indispensable and strategic war industry. As F. Trubee Davison, son of a Morgan partner and recent Secretary of War for Aviation put it, "We in the War Department are taking a great interest in the airplane industry. . . . We must have in this country an aviation industry that can produce the best in the world."

Fortune Magazine, the special class journal of the millionaires, observed, April 27, 1933, "No doubt there are good and sufficient reasons for the Government subsidizing the aviation industry through air mail. For one thing it benefits the users of air mail as well as the carrier. For another thing—*far more important*—it builds up national defense. . . ." (Our italics.)

It was reported by Standard Statistics last year that military orders then accounted for at least 75% of the aircraft business of the United States.

The latest government announcement of preparations in the aviation field states that some 290 *new planes for the navy alone* will be built in connection with the 32 war vessels provided for under the Industrial Recovery Act. Cost of these planes will be about $9,362,000, in addition to the $238,020,000 allocated for the 32 new naval vessels.

Even before the announcement of these new appropriations it should be noted that annual United States appropriations for *naval aviation* increased from $22,000,000 in 1926-27 to $31,600,000 in 1931-32. And appropriations for the *Army Air Corps* increased from $19,000,000 in 1926-27 to $33,000,000 in 1933-34.

The "five-year plan" of the Army Air Corps (as distinguished from the navy planes), most of which has been completed, calls for 1,800 "serviceable" combat planes. General B. D. Faulois, Chief of the Army Air Corps, testified before the House Military Committee, March 30, 1933, that there were already 924 of this type on hand, in addition to 112 "service type" combat planes undergoing final tests, thus making a total of 1,036 combat planes fit for immediate service. However, about 600 more planes for training and other purposes were also on the rolls at the time. At the same hearings, Brigadier General William Mitchell advanced plans for 2,000 long distance bombers and 50 Zeppelin airships.

In January, 1933, the War Department awarded a $2,000,000 contract for 38 high-speed bombing planes to the Glenn L. Martin Co. of Baltimore. According to the "guarded announcement" at the time, as reported by the *New York Times* (Jan. 27, 1933), this "is believed to be the most powerful military weapon produced by any nation since the World War." The planes were said to be faster even than the 111Boeing P-26 planes contracted for about the same time for $1,700,000.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

On June 22, the Curtiss Aeroplane and Motor Co. alone announced receipt of an order of 46 *new attack planes* of the type described as the "flying fortress." "They carry five machine guns and a bomb under the fuselage."

In view of the danger of war in the Pacific it is reported that the 400-plane force of the U. S. Navy is to be concentrated in Southern California waters. This is said to be the greatest airfleet ever placed under a single command.

The fact that the air industry is being groomed for war, as we have noted, is of special importance because of the fact that, regardless of the number of planes on hand when hostilities are declared —total military airplanes of all branches of U. S. war services now *total* over 3,000—they can be built *very rapidly* in the existing plants. Thus during the last months of the World War, the number of planes being produced by the United States and Germany alone came to 2,000 a month. As R. L. Buell, Research Director of the Foreign Policy Association, points out: "The air strength of the powers in war time will not be determined so much by limitation agreements as by the capacity of output following the outbreak of war which no treaty can attempt to control."

The number of planes on hand, therefore, is little indication of the potential production of planes once war is declared. This in turn is determined by what the government is doing to prepare the country industrially for war.

BUILDING THE WAR INDUSTRIES

The aircraft industry is obviously not the only one being carefully prepared to turn out finished products on a war basis. According to reports to the War Policies Commission at least 17,000 factories have been placed on an allocation basis and given what are called "educational orders" in order to fit them for instant operation on war requirements. The country has been divided into what are known as "procurement areas" for the purpose of securing immediate delivery of supplies on the outbreak of hostilities. "Industrial mobilization" is being practiced in almost every industry in the country, for there is scarcely a branch that is not counted as a possible war industry.

Industrial preparedness is dealt with in every report of the War Department. For example, in the annual report of the Secretary of War in 1931 appears the statement of General Douglas MacArthur, Chief of Staff, who in discussing the procurement of munitions declares: "I wish to emphasize particularly the importance of the various items of ammunition. Here are commodities produced in small amounts, or not at all in peace time, which must be furnished in almost unbelievably large quantities in a major emerg-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ency." General MacArthur proposed a detailed plan for lining up the various industries in time of war to take care of the 4,000 articles on the "vitally essential list." He reported that, "A so called industrial survey is conducted to learn what items each plant is best suited to produce. Capacity of each plant is carefully estimated in order to determine possibilities of procurement. Assistance in this work is obtained from existing governmental agencies, from trade associations (now being strengthened significantly under the National Industrial Recovery Act—R. W. D.) and, in individual plants, from the actual plant executives."

THE A. F. OF L. LENDS A HAND

"The American Federation of Labor cooperated closely with the government in this work" of procurement planning for war, declares Lt. Col. Richard Stockton in his recent book, *Inevitable War*. And he was stating a fact that had been brought out in the hearings before the War Policies Commission and indicated in speeches before the Army War College by William Green and Matthew Woll. The latter's words are remembered with particular concern by American workers: "American labor has always looked in a most kindly and friendly way upon the military arm of our government. It has always demonstrated its willingness to cooperate with that branch of the government in every way possible. . . . The American Federation of Labor has only words of kindness for the Army. It is willing to cooperate with it in any way it can." And William Green, before the Army War College, declared that the labor leaders "will lend their whole-hearted loyal and patriotic assistance to their country to the end that every skilled craftsman within their membership will make any sacrifice necessary for the success, the honor and the perpetuity of the institutions of our country"—those institutions being, as Mr. Green has pointed out in many of his speeches, the institutions of private property, the institutions of capitalism.

The cooperation of the A. F. of L. leaders has been so close that the part the labor officialdom is to play in war preparations, and in the carrying on of war when declared, has been clearly outlined in plans drawn up by the War Department.

The labor leaders are to be called upon to "procure" labor just as the capitalists are asked to "procure" commodities sold at a neat profit. A "Labor Administration" is to be formed "to guide labor into useful channels and to retain it therein so far as possible." And the War Department program declares also that, "Labor will be represented in all important government agencies dealing with industrial matters," just as these labor leaders are now represented

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in the carrying out of the Industrial Recovery Act. "There will be a labor committee in the office of the Assistant Secretary of War and in the office of the director of war industry." The War Department plan states specifically that "labor will be represented in the organization of the director of war industry by the appointment of its natural leaders to positions on the war-service committees." It needs no words to define whom the government will regard as the "natural leaders" of labor—the Wolls, Greens and Lewises. In fact the War Department leaves no doubt as to who is meant, for it shows with elaborate charts how the Labor Administration will be made up of employers nominated by the National Industrial Conference Board and "five members nominated by the American Federation of Labor" who are to act as "liason officers with labor."

Then in the so-called Industrial Division of the office of the Secretary of War there is to be a Labor Section presided over by a colonel and a major. A function of this office will be to "maintain close contact through local representatives, with industry, with all agencies of the labor administrator, and with *recognized* organizations of both employers and employees."* (Our italics.) In other words, the militant unions will be outlawed, just as the I.W.W. was during the world war. The "recognized" unions will be the same as those that are now being built up and dealt with under the Industrial Recovery Act.

This National Industrial Recovery Act is in itself an essential part of the war preparations. The way in which it is being put over by the very men who directed the various "labor administrations" in the World War; the important part played in this work by stock gambler Bernard Baruch, Chairman of the War Industries Board during the war, and his various military appointees; the extraordinary centralization of government in the hands of Roosevelt, giving him complete war-time powers; and the relation of the public works sections to naval preparations—these are only a few of the aspects of the law which reflect the preparedness character of this phase of the "New Deal."

SHIPPING MUNITIONS

The sale and shipment of arms and munitions from one country to another has been steadily on the increase in recent months and has been exposed to some extent in a number of pamphlets such as *The Secret International* (Union of Democratic Control, London).

The press occasionally carries stories dealing with special incidents connected with this traffic, such as the Italian shipments of

* See *War Policies Commission*, Hearings, 71st Congress, second session (H. J. Res. 251) Pt. 2.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

rifles and hundreds of machine guns across Austria into Hungary, or the fact that sales of arms, powder and munitions by French firms were three times greater in 1932 than in 1931. So far as the United States is concerned, State Department figures showed that munition exports from this country for 1930 amounted to $7,462,000, but this figure included only munitions and small arms and excluded the very important item of airplanes and parts. More recently the government has ceased to give out special reports on the figures for these groups of exports. And even those figures on munitions shipments that are produced by various countries are out of date and unreliable and give no real picture of the extent of this traffic. Usually even in the figures published by the League of Nations the total world export figures are several millions higher than the import figures. This indicates the concealment of purchases by certain governments. It is clear that a great deal of war materials are shipped in the guise of "fireworks," or "sporting arms" and they have frequently been shipped labeled "pianos," "farm implements," "machinery parts" and the like.

Foreign governments backed by the United States are buying arms continually in the United States, both Colombia and Bolivia having purchased considerable supplies here in connection with the wars in South America. And the *Wall Street Journal* reported, June 19, that the Waco Aircraft Corp. of Toledo has just received an order from Brazil for seven army planes. This makes a total of 71 ships, at a cost of $800,000, purchased this year by Brazil from this single company.

United States companies, with the consent of the United States government, have also been selling large quantities of nitrates, cotton linters, scrap iron and steel to Japan, all of these obviously for war purposes. In addition large quantities of tin plate waste, copper and tubes are being shipped. Last year 62 per cent of all scrap iron exported from the United States went to Japan. Nitrates in tremendous quantities have been shipped from Hopewell, Va., on Japanese freighters from plants of the Atmospheric Nitrogen Corp.

These shipments from the United States are of such great importance that the State Department, early this year, suppressed a public hearing on the subject and a little later, after conference with Pierre and Lammot du Pont, chemical manufacturers, announced that the United States policy on these shipments would not be changed. *The necessity of keeping the leading war industries primed for war tempos was again emphasized by this decision.*

TRAINING NEW RESERVES

Although there has been much talk of "economy in government" and other departments have been cut, especially by the reduction of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

personnel and the laying off of workers, the cuts at first announced in the army under the Roosevelt regime have been largely abandoned. On May 29 it was announced that 6,000 officers of the army would be required to "supervise" the so-called Civilian Conservation Corps camps, a number twice as large as that supposed to have been dropped through the "economies" in the War Department.

These Civilian Conservation Corps camps also have a meaning in the picture of war preparations, in spite of the vigorous assertions to the contrary by members of the Roosevelt cabinet, notably the Secretary of Labor. For the regular army officers assigned to "supervise" these camps carry over into this "civilian" work their own military methods. Drills and formations very similar, if not identical, to those used in "rookie" training in the army are being used, in addition to a surfeit of patriotic talks and preparedness propaganda. A worker from the Chicago area reports that, "We are being taught to shoot. . . . The sergeant told us last night that we might as well get used to the idea that the military training we get here will soon be very useful." Another corps member reports from Pittsburgh: "We were told at Fort Monroe that in case of any emergency we would be turned into a fighting machine immediately." Similar reports, indicating the essentially military nature of the talk, the drills and the general routine, come from others in the camps. Regardless of the protestations of innocent motives by cabinet officials, the Roosevelt regime has placed in the hands of the military at least 274,000 young men of military age who are being given at least the preliminary training for war. And Melvin Ryder, the same man who edited the official organ of the American Expeditionary Forces during the World War, is on the job editing, in the same vein, the tabloid *Happy Days*, official weekly for the 1,330 camps.

The rapid recruiting of these young unemployed workers had been the most valuable experience the army had had since the World War, Col. Duncan K. Major, Jr., declared on July 1, according to the *New York Times*. The rate of recruiting the men, he stated, was faster than during the first three months of the World War for the army and navy combined.

In addition to these new recruits for potential war service we have the spectacle of a great increase in the growth of military training in the schools and colleges of the United States.

In 1932 military training was given to nearly 150,000 students in some 313 institutions, as compared with 94 schools and less than 30,000 students affected in 1912.

According to Joshua Winters, writing in the *Student Review*, December, 1932, "In the decade from 1921 to 1931, the federal

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

government spent $106,965,041 for the *Reserve Officers Training Corps*. . . . In 1931, $6,000,000 was appropriated for the R.O. T. C. and *Citizens Military Training Camps*, excluding the pay of commissioned officers and enlisted men in charge of these activities and the interest and depreciation on material equipment used." The enrollment in the R.O.T.C. increased from less than 99,000 in 1920 to over 131,000 in 1930. As for the Citizens Military Training Camps, the Troy *Record*, commenting on the importance of last year's turnout, observed, "The 39,061 young men of the C. M. T. C. . . . are not so disquietingly in evidence as 39,000 regular officers would be. But they are 'on call.'"

In addition to these, and the *Regular Army* of over 132,000 "active land forces," we have the *National Guards*, trained with subsidies from the federal government. Some 181,000 of these were provided for last year as compared with 47,000 enlisted in 1920. National Guard provisions in the federal budget bill totalled nearly $56,000,000. At the same time the *Organized Reserve Corps* increased from 68,000 in 1920 to over 113,000 in June, 1931, with appropriations for their training during the same period rising from $2,751,000 to $6,542,000.

* * * *

In the face of such intense preparations as we have sketched, any talk of "disarmament" by the capitalist powers, and especially by the American empire, is utter hypocrisy, misleading the masses and diverting them from the real struggle against war and the causes of wars. Peace talk is used to confuse and delude the peoples of the world while the rival empires prepare for struggle among themselves or for joint action against the Soviet Union, the only country that has made any genuine and honest proposals for complete abolition of all the means of warfare.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The War in the Far East and Our Tasks

By K. KITA

GENERAL REMARKS

NEARLY two years have passed since the Japanese imperialists, under the pressure of the disastrous economic crisis and taking advantage of the difficult position of the rival imperialists, set out on a long-planned-for military adventure on the Asiatic continent.*

Officially, war was never declared. But the action of Japan was plainly and indisputably a robber war.

The thundering guns of Japanese invaders massacred tens of thousands of Chinese and wounded innumerably more; village after village was ruined; hundreds of thousands of peasants were driven off their land; the means of livelihood and homes of millions were taken away. Banks were seized, arsenals occupied, and Chinese railways taken over. The Japanese declared the three eastern provinces "independent"; formed the government of Manchukuo, and made Pu yui, former boy Emperor of the defunct Manchu dynasty, "head" of the new State. They, however, kept actual control of the new State in the hands of a "Board of General Affairs" composed of seven Japanese. They "transferred," despite opposition from British and American sources, customs revenues from Dairen, China's second largest port, and from other points, to the hands of the new State. They signed a protocol with the government at Hsin-king (Changchun) under the terms of which Japan was assured of a robber's right even to "station" its own "forces" that it considers "necessary" "at any point it (Japan) may select in Manchuria." General Nobuyoshi Muto, later Field-Marshal, was appointed Japan's ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to Manchuria. He was to be, in himself, ambassador, head of Kwantung leased territory, and commander of Kwantung army. In the middle of March, 1933, at the first "anniversary" of Manchukuo, after the League of Nations decided to accept the report and recommendations of the "Committee of Nineteen" "censuring" Japan, the rich province of Jehol was incorporated by force into the territory of Manchukuo. Dolonnor in the north-

* See "Tanaka Memorandum," *Communist International*, December 30, 1931. Also available in pamphlet form—Workers Library Publishers, 5c.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

west was occupied, and conquest of the entire Chahar province and a further march to Mongolia were planned.

In China proper the Japanese invaders were also busily at work. In the early part of 1932 Shanghai was heavily bombarded on the pretext of "getting satisfaction" for China's "insolent anti-Japanese activities." Chapei, the Chinese quarter of the city, was reduced to ashes. Over 24,000 Chinese were killed. In this campaign, however, they were not successful. Meeting moral as well as virtual military defeat at the hands of the determined rank and filers of the Canton 19th Route Army, which was finally betrayed by the Kuomintang leaders but supported throughout by the city workers, students and thousands of others, they made a hasty retreat and after British mediation, signed a "truce" in May.

To the Yangtse, to the Yellow Sea, to Kwantung leased territory, increased numbers of destroyers, gunboats and cruisers were sent. Guards in Peiping and Tientsin, as well as Hankow, and other cities, were carefully re-enforced. After the conquest of Jehol province in the early part of this year, a general offensive, long expected but repeatedly denied, was started beyond the Great Wall of North China. On May 23, Japanese forces were reported within 13 miles of the gate to Peiping, one time capital of the Chinese Empire. Rumors (behind which were several actual plottings by the secret agents of the Japanese General Staff) of setting up, under Japanese hegemony, another "independent" republic were heard. Dubious Chinese generals, politicians, etc., were swarming to the city, busy with intrigue. Then quite unceremoniously, on May 31, they signed a "truce" with the Kuomintang leaders at Tangku. The terms of "truce," however, quite significantly left the fate of "renegade" Chinese generals operating in the newly created neutral zone undetermined.

In the meantime, every conceivable measure was resorted to to turn Manchuria into a *place d'armes* for an early intervention against the U.S.S.R. The construction of the Tunhua-Hoiren Railway, a most important military strategic line in Manchuria which would facilitate the transportation of Japanese troops from the main island at least 24 hours faster, was speeded up with the employment of forced Chinese and Korean labor. Old airdromes were improved and new ones opened. Tanks, airplanes, armored trains, machine guns, ammunition, etc., were brought up. The arming and settlement in Manchuria of 500,000 ex-servicemen was initiated and encouraged by the government and the War Ministry. The army of the new Manchurian State was organized out of old material under Japanese instructors. Russian white guardists in

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Manchuria, who had for ten long years following the withdrawal of Japanese interventionist forces from Siberia been fed and clothed by the Japanese general staff, were subsidized and armed anew, while hundreds more were brought from Europe. And finally a campaign of provocations against the U.S.S.R., the latest being the forceful cutting off of through traffic on the Chinese-Eastern Railway, was inaugurated. Offers by the Soviet government for a non-aggression pact were stubbornly refused by Tokio.*

After the establishment of Manchukuo, under the pretext that the government at Changchun succeeded sovereign power of Nanking in this region, the Japanese imperialists not only let the Manchukuo officials become the joint operators (with the Soviet Union) of the line, but also began to "dispute" the Soviet ownership of the line itself. The Japanese imperialists are not satisfied with the actual control of the line. They are out to acquire even the "legal" title to the line.

The government of the Soviet Union, which consistently adheres to a peaceful policy, seeing that the Chinese Eastern Railway in its hands is again becoming, through no fault of its own but through the designs of the imperialists, a stumbling block in the friendly relations of the countries concerned, offered its sale, this time either to Manchukuo or Japan, "to remove the source of conflict." In 1930 the Soviet government had offered the sale of the line to the Nanking-Mukden government, but the latter was "unable to buy" because their treasury was empty due to squandering and plundering by the corrupt leadership and a heavy drain for civil war purposes, specifically upon the Soviet districts.

After the exchange of several notes, negotiations for the sale of the line between the Soviet Union and Manchukuo (Japan) are soon to open. In the meantime, the Japanese newspaper, *Kokumin* (Nation) raises the question of the Soviet Union "ceding" Vladivostok, eastern terminal port of the Trans-Siberian Railway and immediately connected with the Chinese Eastern Railway to Japan, along with the line itself. The robber designs of Japanese impe-

* Note: The Chinese Eastern Railway is the sole property of the U.S.S.R. It is, however, jointly operated by China and the U.S.S.R. on the basis of the agreement of 1924 purely as a commercial enterprise. The U.S.S.R. had previously renounced all political, territorial and military rights which Czarist Russia wrested from China in connection with the construction of the Chinese-Eastern Railway at the end of the last century. Economically this line, which runs through fertile soya-bean producing fields and has access to rich timber regions, cattle-raising areas, etc., is very important. From a military standpoint, too, it is an indispensable railway to whoever plans military attack from the east on the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. The incident of 1929 is too new and significant to be forgotten.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

rialism, the backhand intrigues of other imperialists, thus become glaringly clear.

During these two years, Japanese imperialism dismembered China. It converted Manchuria, now completely severed from Kuomintang China, into its colony and at the same time turned it thoroughly into a *place d'armes* for an early intervention against the U.S.S.R. Northern China, the territory south of the Great Wall, despite the "truce" and the "pledges" of the Japanese generals, is constantly under threat from Japanese guns. Nor is South China guaranteed from Japanese attack. It must be mentioned that the hold of Japanese imperialism over its other colonies, Korea and Formosa, has been greatly tightened.

THE KUOMINTANG LEADERS BETRAY

By their failure or unwillingness to defend the country from the invaders, the Kuomintang rulers and their allies once more proved themselves to be the betrayers of the Chinese masses. Chang-Hsue-liang, with 50,000 soldiers, did not even offer a show of resistance to the Japanese. Despite boasts and declarations "to defend to the last man," Chinchow was shamelessly given up. Chiang Kai-shek, Commander-in-Chief of the Chinese Army, finding himself "too occupied" with anti-Communist activities, refused to take up the personal charge of the country's defense against the Japanese, despite popular clamor. At the same time, workers, students and other intellectuals, who agitated for resistance, were arrested, jailed and in many cases executed by his order. Huang ping, secretary of the All-China Trade Union Federation and member of the Executive Committee of the Anti-Imperialist League, was among the arrested and imprisoned. Privately initiated boycott movement against Japanese goods was greatly discouraged. When, at the time of Japan's Shanghai attack, rank and filers of the 19th Route Army put up a heroic resistance—for two weeks these poorly equipped, outnumbered Chinese soldiers held out against the superior forces of the Japanese—it was the Kuomintang leaders who kept them unsupported and finally ordered their retreat. They signed the "truce" of Shanghai on May 5, 1932, with Japan, the raper of the Chinese people.

THE MASSES FIGHT

This complete capitulation of the Kuomintang leaders before the invading Japanese, however, *did not mean that China (not the Kuomintang) submitted without resistance.* No. After September 18, 1931, a great wave of the popular anti-imperialist movement arose anew. The boycott of Japanese goods movement, which

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

had already been shaping itself in connection with Japan's preparatory activities prior to the actual seizure of Manchuria, increased in momentum. In Manchuria itself, from which Chang-Hsueliang quite summarily fled and where there had existed little anti-imperialist movement before, a great popular resistance was inaugurated. Armed struggles against the invaders and the Manchukuo forces became almost a daily occurence. So great was this latter that even such a bourgeois professor as Tyril Dennet of Princeton had to admit in one of his contributions to *Current History* (January, 1933) that "although China looks to Washington and to Geneva for help, she is at the present moment receiving more effective aid from . . . the pertinacity of the 'volunteers' in Manchuria."

CHINESE SOVIET GOVERNMENT—LEADER OF ANTI-IMPERIALIST STRUGGLES OF THE CHINESE MASSES

One thing must be especially emphasized here. That is the role of the Central Soviet Government of China. This government, under the leadership of the Communist Party of China, has shown itself to be the only government of China capable of inspiring, organizing and leading powerful anti-imperialist struggles of the Chinese masses. Right after the invasion of Manchuria, it was the Soviet government of China, then a provisional committee, that declared war against the Japanese invaders, called for armed resistance, inspired all forms of struggle—boycott, strikes, etc. It was this government which exposed the role of Nanking, and the League of Nations, and warned the Chinese masses not to expect help from them. This government, however, showed its willingness to cooperate even with the treacherous Kuomintang or any other forces in the fight against the Japanese invaders, provided they agreed: 1) to arm the people; 2) to grant at once democratic rights, free speech, free press, right of assembly and organization, and cease immediately the imprisonment, torture and killing of revolutionaries; 3) to stop advancing against the Soviet districts.

Kuomintang leaders not only ignored this proposal, which was made numerous times, but in January, 1933, started the fifth anti-Communist "punitive" expedition under the personal command of Chiang-Kai-shek while no effort was made to defend Jehol, then in danger, not to speak of regaining Manchuria.

JAPANESE IMPERIALISTS MEET RESISTANCE AT HOME

Prior to the actual intervention, the Japanese ruling classes took thorough measures ideologically and otherwise preparing the masses for the contemplated robber war. A systematic campaign to the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

effect that "Manchuria is the country's life-line," that it was "in danger" and that "something must be done before it was too late," etc., etc., had been carried through in earnest. Several army airplanes flew over some of the important cities and dropped inflamatory literature. Simultaneously with this, every precaution was taken to "root out" possible sources of opposition to war. Suppression of the Communist Party and other revolutionary organizations was carried out with extreme severity. On August 26, immediately before the intervention, no less than 1200 workers, students and other intellectuals were rounded up. Despite these precautionary measures, voices of protest went up immediately. Demonstrations were organized, leaflets were issued clarifying the nature of the invasion, advocating defeatist slogans and urging support of the Chinese people and the Soviet Union. And in no small instances—Tokyo subway workers' strike, for example—strikes were organized and successfully fought. Not only this, really "disquieting" things began to unfold. Three hundred soldiers revolted at Fushum, Manchuria, Two hundred or more refused to fight against the Chinese at Shanghai and had to be sent back to Japan. There were disturbances among the men in the Nakano Telegraph Company of the Imperial Japanese Army. Communist Party cells were "discovered" at Kure and Yokoshuka naval bases, etc., etc. The Japanese army and navy, which the ruling classes considered "invincible" and "uncorruptible"—i.e., against "Communist plottings"—were proved to be not so "trustworthy." And this was a new development with which the Communist Party of Japan must be credited.

SOCIAL FASCISTS SUPPORT ROBBER WAR

The ruling classes, however, were partly "compensated" in the persons of various social-democratic leaders of the Japanese labor movement. Some of these men went "clear" to open fascism while others preferred to retain their social-democratic appearances. They were unanimous, however, in supporting the robber war of their masters. Some said that the present war was not an imperialist war. Others reasoned shamelessly: "Japan is poor and China is rich (territorially and in natural wealth). Japan's war, hence, is a life and death struggle of the poor." Their capitulation was so complete and helpful that General Araki, the War Minister, in the summer of 1933, sent special words of gratitude for their "services to the Mikado's land."

As for the Second International and the Parties affiliated to it, they, including the Socialist Party of America, acted treacherously and dangerously, at first, by making the workers believe that the imperialist League of Nations could stop the war, and later, when

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the swindle of the League of Nations was exploded before the eyes of the world proletariat, by their effort to represent the League as "helpless" and its "authorities" as being "undermined," etc. They "condemned" the Japanese social democrats for their support of their masters, but, concretely have taken no step to fight against war. Norman Thomas declared as late as June 3, 1933, in the *New Leader*: ". . . and it is the League which finally rendered the moral judgement of mankind in the case of the undeclared war of Japan against China."

PEACEFUL U.S.S.R—PREDATORY WAR-MONGERING IMPERIALIST POWERS

The U.S.S.R. is the only country where workers are the masters. Having overthrown capitalism and hence having done away with all the inherent contradictions of capitalism, she has no need to seek imperialist expansion. Her sole concern is the peaceful building of Socialism and living in peace with the neighboring nations. During her long years of existence she has consistently striven to live up to this principle. During the past 21 months of Japanese campaign, innumerable provocations, some of them astoundingly brazen in character, were made by Japanese imperialists. The capitalist press of the world a hundred times "predicted" a Japan-Soviet war, thus giving "moral" support to Japan in her provocative activities against the U.S.S.R. *The Soviet Union,* although ready to defend its territory against the imperialist invaders, *would not be provoked into imperialist war.* It even proposed to sell the Chinese Eastern Railway to Manchukuo (Japan) "to remove the source of conflict." The peace policy of the Soviet Union is well expressed in Comrade Stalin's words:

"We do not want an inch of enemy's territory, but we will not give up an inch of ours."

She took a strict neutral attitude both towards Japan and China in the conflict.

In violent contrast to this, stand the imperialist powers of the world. French and British imperialisms did not hesitate to take advantage of this new opening in the partition of China, and marched their forces from Indo-China and Thibet respectively at the same time increasing their garrison forces and fleet in other parts of China. Their attitude toward Japanese imperialism was that of open and secret support. The United States of America stood firmly against Japan's Manchurian occupation, not out of sympathy for China but because this was a violent defiance of previous "agreements" concerning China which were decidedly in favor

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of United States imperialism. At the same time, however, she shipped ammunition and other war materials to Japan in large quantities.

SINO-JAPANESE "TRUCE" OF MAY 31, 1933, AND R. F. C. LOAN TO NANKING

In the twentieth month of the prolonged Japanese robber campaign on the Asiatic continent, after weeks of bitter fighting near and beyond the Great Wall in which anywhere from 15,000 to 30,000 lives were lost on the Chinese side alone, with scores of thousands of wounded, when the invading Japanese troops were within 13 miles of the gate to Peiping and the city itself was virtually controlled by Japanese garrisons stationed there, and talk of setting up a governing board for "independent" Northern China was current, on May 31, news was quite unceremoniously brought out to the effect that a "truce" was signed between the Japanese and the Kuomintang leaders at Tangku. By the terms of the "truce" a "neutral zone" was created south of the Great Wall, the Chinese forces to immediately withdraw from the territories specified. The policing of these territories was to be in the hands of the "Chinese," but Japan was to see to it that everything goes "right."

"No political questions figured in the deal," it was categorically asserted. There was a general acclamation of this "truce" by the American bourgeois press.

MEANING OF "TRUCE"—THE MOTIVES BEHIND IT

The "truce" *has not ended* Japan's undeclared war against China, though every effort was made in the bourgeois press to make their readers believe that it has. If anything, the "truce" only ended the *first phase* of Japan's present dismemberment of China. But this "ending," it must be remembered, simultaneously *opened up* another phase.

Financially almost bankrupt, meeting uncalculated, subtle, resistance from the aroused anti-imperialist masses of China, finding for the first time organized opposition within the country and with the inter-imperialist contradictions tremendously sharpened, Japan could not carry on military operations against China on all fronts and continuously. The rise of Hitlerism in Germany and the consequent political uncertainty in Europe, the maneuvers of United States imperialism to "isolate" Japan from British and French support, the sharpened trade rivalry between Britain and Japan (dumping of Japan), the life and death struggle of British and United

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

States imperialisms now reaching a new height, all worked against Japanese imperialism. Then there were the repeated successes of the Chinese Red Army, and the Soviet Union, which Japanese imperialism labored to draw into water, firmly and unshakably refusing to be provoked. The path of Japanese imperialism was not so easy. And after all, the immediate objective of Japan's present campaign to establish herself firmly on the Asiatic continent so that it could have reliable material bases for future expansionist war, was to a great extent "achieved." "Manchurian gains must be consolidated" (!). Besides, the beginning of "direct negotiations" between China and Japan must be made in which the former will officially "recognize" the "loss of Manchuria" and make further "concessions" which, by the way, the imperialists entrenched in the League of Nations as well as the United States try to block. And this, the sooner the better. This was the desire and intention of the Japanese imperialists.

On the Chinese side—among the Kuomintang betrayers, of course—there were their own "reasons." The anxiety of Chiang-Kai-shek and co-betrayers of the Nanking regime was increasingly "how to free their hand from 'Japanese worries' and be able to concentrate upon the fight against the 'Communist menace' at home" and "rehabilitate" themselves. "Help" from the League of Nations was not quite to the liking of the Nanking leaders. The chances were, however, that "better help" might come from the dollar imperialists whose lackey Nanking has been and still is. The "help" came in the form of America's participation—to what extent, we are not in a position to say at this moment—in the present Sino-Japanese "truce."

U. S. IMPERIALISM

The traditional policy of United States imperialism in the Far East is the "Open Door." Coming late into the Far Eastern field, U. S. imperialism already in the last decade of the 19th century found the process of dismemberment of China by the imperialist powers so far progressed that the only and best policy to be adopted would be to work for "unified China" and for the "open door." This policy, expounded in 1899 by John Hay, then Secretary of State, United States imperialism has adhered to consistently. In 1922 at the Washington Conference, United States imperialism succeeded in forcing British imperialism to discontinue the Anglo-Japanese alliance which for 20 long years had played a dominant role in the plunder of China and the entire Far East. Seven capitalist powers, as well as China, "accepted" the United States proposal to "respect the territorial integrity of China" and to "refrain

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

from taking advantage of conditions in China to seek special rights or privileges." This was a decided victory for Far Eastern expansionist policy of the United States.

Japanese imperialism which was forced to swallow the Washington Treaty concerning China in 1922, ten years later, under pressure of the economic crisis and taking advantage of the difficult positions of other imperialist powers, marched by force, occupied Manchuria, bombarded Shanghai, moved to the south of the Great Wall, and thus violently defied United States imperialism. Naturally, United States imperialism, under Stimson, protested violently although at first it was very cautious. It professed its stern position "not to recognize any treaties or gains . . . obtained through the violation of the pact of August 27, 1928." (Stimson note of January 7, 1932), at the same time laboring hard to direct Japan's main blow toward the Soviet Union.

Under Roosevelt this position of United States imperialism did not undergo any change. If it did, it added more insistent character. United States imperialism under Roosevelt increased its pressure upon Japan threatening its further "cooperation" with the League. Taking away from Japan its mandated possessions in the South Pacific was secretly discussed. Japanese imperialism has done its utmost to obtain "U. S. understanding" of its position in Manchuria, stressing her "difficult" position of having "two neighbors whose future is uncertain" meaning China and the U.S.S.R. It sent Vice-Admiral Nomura to Washington. Matsuoka, Japan's chief spokesman at Geneva last spring, passed through United States on his way home. Apparently they failed in bringing any substantial result.

When the League of Nations decided to vote for the recommendation of the "Committee of Nineteen" which would *not completely satisfy* the interests of Japan, and when United States was "cooperating" in this with the League powers, Japanese imperialism answered this with forceful annexation of Jehol and the march to Peiping-Tientsin beyond the Great Wall. Their intention was, by this means, to force new and decisive capitulation of the Nanking government to the great dislike of other imperialist powers.

Already in April, when Japan's march beyond the Great Wall started, it was generally believed that a "truce" in the present form would soon be concluded opening a way for the general direct "settlement" of the Sino-Japanese "conflict." Such a "truce" if concluded would not be in the interests of imperialist powers other than Japan. Lampson, British Minister to China, offered his "services" as mediator, but there were obstacles this time. Anglo-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Japanese trade rivalry has reached its most acute form. United States imperialism did not offer its "services," but it acted drastically. It gave its "understanding" in return for which Japan and Nanking also gave a definite "counter understanding." Japan was to embark more determinedly on anti-Soviet provocation and Nanking was to strive to rehabilitate itself by "concentrating upon the Communist menace at home." The report that "Roosevelt recognizes Japan's special position in Manchuria, but hints at the necessity for explanation" (Tokyo *Nichi-Nichi* on Ishii-Roosevelt talk); unusually favorable comment in the American press on the "truce" —(the *New York Times*, for example, hailed the truce, saying this marks "the beginning of an end to Japan's undeclared war against China started in September, 1931," urged Nanking to work for "national unity . . . within whatever boundary Japan may permit her to retain," justified Chiang-Kai-shek's neglect of the defense of the country because of his preoccupation with the fight against the Soviet districts. It referred to Manchuria as being "lost also to Russia"); the R. F. C.'s $50,000,000 loan to Nanking with Roosevelt's sanction, which was concluded before but announced after the signing of the truce; renewed anti-Soviet provocations of Japan (landing of Japanese forces in Kamchatka in violation of international treaties; demand in the Japanese press that the Soviet Union "cede" Vladivostok to Japan, etc.); all these should be understood to indicate the kind of bargaining Japan and the United States have had. However, this "understanding" is not lasting or far-reaching. The United States-Japanese contradiction over the Pacific is so great that there cannot be any such agreement. It would be an impermissible opportunist mistake to think that there is a tendency for rapprochement between the United States and Japan, not to speak of a United States-Japanese alliance against Great Britain.

OUR TASKS

The Twelfth Plenum of the E.C.C.I. held almost a year ago, August, 1932, stated:

> "The attack of Japanese imperialism on China . . . which is taking place . . . marks the *beginning of a new imperialist war.*"

One year has passed since then and proved conclusively the correctness of the analysis of the E.C.C.I.

Touching upon the tasks of the Communist Parties in regard to the war in the Far East, the Plenum said:

> ". . . the main task of all Communist Parties is to organize

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and lead the struggle of the workers, peasants and all toilers *for the defense of China and the Chinese revolution, for the defense of the fatherland of the workers of all countries, the U.S.S.R., against the closely approaching intervention and for the defense of the toilers of capitalist countries against a new imperialist war.*"

Did our Party strive toward fulfilling this main task? Certainly! But to a satisfactory extent? Unfortunately, no.

SOME OF THE REASONS WHY WE FAILED IN THE PAST

There are a few reasons why we failed. One is the fact that there was, for a brief period, within our ranks some *inclarity as to the role of American imperialism* in the present war in the Far East. This fact made it difficult for us to effectively fight against American imperialism.

The fact that the United States was not actively engaged in actual warfare was over-emphasized. At the same time this wrong emphasis resulted in the hazy conclusion that Japanese imperialism is worse because it is attacking China, and that the United States-Japanese antagonisms, which were brought to almost open conflict at one time as a result of Japan's present military adventure in Manchuria and in China proper, is the *main key* in determining our attitude. *The fact that China is warred against, that the Soviet Union is threatened, and that American imperialism has its own share in all these was temporarily relegated to a secondary position.* Our main fire was concentrated against Japanese imperialism *at the cost of our proper fight against our own imperialism.*

The second reason is the fact that our Party is still quite *disconnected with the masses at the factories, mills, shops, docks, and in the Army and Navy.* This is the reason why we were, and still are, unable to effectively stop the shipment of munitions and war materials to Japan which is assuming greater and greater proportions in recent months.

The Plenums of our Central Committee have thoroughly dealt with this weakness of our Party and it only remains that the decisions be put into practice.

The third reason is the inadequate Bolshevik resistance within our Party to the opportunist underestimation of the war in China, of the danger of imperialist war and military intervention, and to the failure to understand all the peculiarities of the present drift towards a new war, to individual pacifist deviations from Leninist teachings on war, to opportunist passivity with regard to war.

IMMEDIATE TASKS OF OUR PARTY IN FIGHT AGAINST IMPERIALIST WAR IN CONNECTION WITH WAR IN THE FAR EAST

United States imperialism's role in the present war in the Far

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

East is quietly but quite surely *changing from that of a partial participant (supplying of war materials, etc.) to that of a fuller participant. Yet in the past few months our efforts in the field of anti-war activities dangerously slackened. This must be rectified immediately.* At the present moment our Party must combine the efforts:

1) To develop mass activities such as: strikes of the workers in workshops connected with munitions and in transport undertakings, protest demonstrations, mass campaigns which will lead to effective prevention of transportation of munitions.

2) To watch and expose every step of American imperialism which is made in preparation for "peacefully gliding over" to fuller participation in war.

3) Generally to strengthen the mass economic and political struggles of the workers against capitalism.

4) To do extensive mass work among the unemployed showing them that war will not bring prosperity.

5) To win over Negroes, immigrant workers and American farmers against the imperialist war and for the support of a national liberation movement of the Chinese masses, and carry on special work among the Japanese workers and farmers in the U. S.

6) To energetically and systematically unmask pacifists, social-fascists, etc.

7) To relentlessly expose every new step of Japanese imperialism to extend its predatory aims.

8) To come out more boldly for the defense of the Soviet Union explaining in particular that the Soviet Union is a powerful factor in the struggle against war, and such a struggle is helpful in delaying the moment when the workers of the world, including the American workers, are plunged into the horrors of blood and privation of a new imperialist war.

Capitalist stabilization has come to an end and the transition to a second round of wars and revolutions has started. It is our duty to do our utmost to mobilize the American toilers for the defense of the Chinese people, the Soviet Union, and the defense of the American toilers themselves against the new imperialist war which will bring unheard-of havoc, ruin and destruction.

In carrying out this task we must remember that it is essential that we:

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

". . . go to the masses with Lenin's teachings that imperialist war is caused by capitalism, and that the only guarantee against new imperialist wars and intervention is the conversion of imperialist war into civil war and the overthrow of capitalism." (XII Plenum Resolution on War in the Far East and the Tasks of the Communist Parties.)

"For the present imperialist war is a war of the great nations (i. e., those who oppress a number of other nations) conducted *for the purpose* of oppressing new nations. One cannot be "national" in an imperialist war without being a socialist statesman, i. e. without recognizing the right of the oppressed nations to liberation, to separation from the great powers that oppress them. In the era of imperialism there can be no other *salvation* for the *majority* of the nations of the world outside of revolutionary action undertaken by the proletariat of the great nations and reaching beyond the boundaries of nationality, breaking those boundaries, overthrowing the international bourgeoisie. While the bourgeoisie is not overthrown, there remain nations known as "great powers," i.e., there remains the oppression of nine-tenths of the nations of the whole world."—*Lenin.*

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Unity in the Struggle for Social Insurance

By I. AMTER

NEVER before was the need of unity of the working class and of social insurance greater than at the present moment. The situation of the working class, with 17,000,000 unemployed, with almost a like number of part-time workers toiling at miserable wages; the frightful speed-up which has no limit; the increasing attacks on the rights of the workers—all demand the greatest unity.

The promises and actions of the Roosevelt government have not solved the situation. On the contrary, the situation of the workers progressively has worsened. Relief cuts, refusal to accept new applicants, wholesale evictions, growing discrimination against Negro and foreign-born workers, wage-cuts, murder and deportation of working class militants have increased.

This has not stopped the struggles of the workers. Strike struggles are growing. Militant battles of the unemployed have shown that the workers will not accept the capitalist program of further degradation of the working class. In recent months, there have been splendid struggles led in the main by the Unemployed Councils for relief; against forced labor (Washington, Oregon, New Jersey, Minnesota, Rhode Island, Ohio, etc.); against evictions (Pittsburgh, New York); for relief of single workers (Chicago, Pittsburgh, Los Angeles); against Negro discrimination; against high rents (Norfolk, New York); against the commissary plan (Pennsylvania, Washington); for relief from the big capitalists (Ford hunger march); demonstrations at relief bureaus, local demonstrations, county and state marches; cooperation with the striking dairy farmers (Iowa and Wisconsin); presentation of State social insurance bills in many States.

The Roosevelt government now steps forward with the Industrial Recovery Act as the cure-all of all evils in the system. This act is creating illusions, and, being accompanied by tremendous propaganda by the capitalist press and all capitalist agencies, raises false hopes in the minds of masses of workers. Even before it was put into operation, the ballyhoo machine spread false reports of "1,629,000 men having returned to work in April and May," and that "we hope that 5,000,000 men will be back at work by October 1." The purpose of this is to *disarm* the workers and keep them unprepared for the onslaught on their conditions that is in store.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The workers must await *attacks on their living conditions such as they have never experienced before.*

The Industrial Recovery Act compels the capitalists to organize into associations and trade groups. Thus they will be unified in their assaults on the workers under "governmental sanctions and supervision." Not only is the bulk of the workers unorganized in this country, but the capitalists supported by the reformist leaders have done, and will continue to do, everything in their power to divide the employed and unemployed workers, Negro and white workers. To meet these attacks, *unity* of the working class on the basis of a militant program of struggle is imperative.

This unity must embrace all sections of the working class, employed and unemployed, organized and unorganized, white and Negro, native and foreign-born. It must unite the workers irrespective of political or religious opinions or affiliation. Basic to this unity is not the question of the political party the worker belongs to, or a demand that he sever his relations with any political party. The united front clearly implies *unity in struggle on the basis of a program of immediate aims.* In the struggle against hunger and worsening conditions, in the struggle against the Roosevelt program, we can and must unite the broadest sections of the working class and lead the counter-offensive.

This means reaching the workers in the shops and unions, in the neighborhoods and mass organizations. It means the penetration of the most backward as well as the advanced workers and rousing them to carry on a fight for their very existence. It means the most rapid mobilization and organization of the fighting front of the workers against the bosses' program, which leads to worse hunger and to war. This is a challenge to our Party, which the Party will carry out.

The workers are looking for leadership and for unity. They feel their helplessness, being broken into so many groups. The united front under the leadership of the Party establishes that form of struggle that will furnish the weapon and inspire the workers to greater militancy than ever.

The workers demand *security.* In the shop today there is no protection for the worker. Facing the masses outside the mill, the employed workers fear the lowering of wages, the loss of their jobs. Compelled to speed up, they fear their inability to make the pace. Faced with old age, they fear being thrown into the streets. The result today is that workers submit to the most *heartbreaking* conditions in the shops in order to hold their jobs. Accidents, industrial diseases, old age, maternity are throwing hundreds of thousands out of work. This is in addition to the millions who are out of the shops today and will not return to work.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Millions of young workers have not seen the inside of a factory; millions gaduating from the schools and collages each year face the same situation. No matter how much increase in production will take place on the basis of speculation, of taking advantage of present price scales, and for war purposes, there will come an even *greater collapse*, against which the workers demand protection.

This presents the *whole* working class with the clearest demand for security of life, irrespective of whether they obtain work or not. Unemployment relief is totally insufficient, and now is being cut down on the demand of the bankers and landlords. Discrimination against large sections persists. Barest hunger rations have been handed out to the workers, which hardly suffice to keep alive. The worst degradation of the working class is the perspective unless the workers fight. The task of rallying the workers against this situation is clear.

This security is to be found in *Social Insurance* for all workers —a *central* and *immediate* need and demand of the *whole* working class. The struggle for it becomes a *main* task of the Party, and around this demand the broadest united front must be mobilized.

The Party and the Unemployed Councils have succeeded in broadening the united front on a local, State and national scale. The organization at the convention in Chicago of the National Federation of the unemployed organizations was a step in this direction. This convention set up a federation of all unemployed organizations, with the objective of forming neighborhood, city, county and State federations on the same basis. This convention was conceived of by the leaders of the Socialist Party as a means of building a national unemployed organization under Socialist leadership in opposition to the Unemployed Councils. Defeated in this purpose, the Socialists split the convention. A further step was taken at the Pennsylvania convention of the Unemployed Citizens League, from which again the Socialists split. This splitting, strikebreaking activity they repeated in a different form in New York City. Further united front steps will be taken at the Ohio State and national conventions of the Unemployed Citizens League in July. In building these united front federations, the Party and the Unemployed Councils played an outstandingly leading part.

These united fronts, however, embrace only a *fraction* of the working class. If the aim of security is to be achieved, a broader front must be established. The error must be corrected of conceiving that the united front of the unemployed organizations is an aim in itself (New York). The aim of *the united front is to forge a weapon tha will enable us to reach ever broader strata of the working class*, which is yearning for unity and will support it.

The various conventions went on record not only for the united

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

front in action, but also for *merging* the unemployed organizations in the country. This is a goal to be reached through intensified united front struggle. It is an immediate need of the workers particularly in the struggle for Social Insurance.

The main issue of the last election campaign and of the Democratic Party was unemployment insurance. Since March 4, this has been a forgotten slogan of the government, owing to the slackening of *our* struggle for social insurance. The last convention of the American Federation of Labor, reversing the position of the previous convention, went on record endorsing unemployment insurance. But since the convention, the A. F. of L. leaders have dropped the demand in their full support of the Roosevelt program. The Socialist Party put forward a bogus program of unemployment insurance, but now supports the unemployment reserves plans that were proposed in several States, and since have been shelved.

None of these bills would provide insurance for the millions now out of work. These bills are supposed to be a provision against future unemployment, but eliminate from protection large sections of the workers, farm, domestic and white collar workers; workers who have not been employed a specified time within the State; locked out and striking workers; workers who have been discharged for "misconduct." The worker would be compelled to make a contribution to the unemployment reserves fund and accept a waiting period before getting insurance. In some instances, the system is not obligatory on the employers, who may establish a system of their own. The amount of insurance and its duration indicate the "sincere" desire of these disciples of Roosevelt to help the workers. They provide a maximum of 15 weeks of insurance and of $180 in any year—or $3.70 a week throughout the year! This is the type of unemployment insurance promised by the Democratic Party and supported by the leaders of the A. F. of L. and Socialist Party!

The Communist Party declares that the workers are not responsible for the crisis or for unemployment. The workers are fighting against hunger and against the starvation wages, long hours, speed-up, accidents and diseases acquired in the shops. The workers who have toiled long years at the bench want security when superannuated. Working mothers want protection when giving birth to a child. The millions of the permanent army of unemployed want the right to live. This must be a *first charge* on industry and the government—and the employers and the State must be compelled to furnish it.

This demand must be made of the Federal government which has the obligation to care for the welfare of all the workers. Although the demand should also be placed before the State governments, it must be realized that this splits up the forces of the work-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ers in the 48 states, and means delays and constitutional provisions that would only retard the fight. Therefore, although fighting also for State social insurance, the main target of attack should be the Federal government. We must also demand that the employers and the government alone bear the expense of the insurance, and that the workers be exempt from any contributions. Proposals such as that the employers contribute a certain percentage of the payroll are merely a recommendation for a wage cut (California).

The Workers Social Insurance Bill alone embodies security for all workers. The Bill provides social insurance for all workers, irrespective of category, white and Negro, native and foreign-born, men and women, without any discrimination, for the full period of unemployment or disability—accident, sickness, old age, maternity. It provides insurance equivalent to the average wages in the respective industries and localities, but at no time to be less than $10 a week for adult workers and $3 for each dependent. It demands that part-time workers shall receive the difference between their wages and the unemployment insurance benefit. The fund shall be raised by graduated taxation of all incomes above $5,000, and by the use of all war funds for the unemployed. The social insurance fund shall be administered not by government institutions, but by commissions of workers elected through their organizations.

Who should get insurance? Clearly every worker, without discrimination, who is forced into idleness through no fault of his own. The crisis has thrown 17,000,000 out of the shops and factories. These workers and their families have gone through the torture of hell. Many millions of them have received no aid whatever either from public or private institutions. The result has been Rooseveltburgs, jungles, suicides, and insanity on an unprecedented scale. Millions of workers tramp up and down the country in search of a crust of bread. Millions more have obtained relief from the municipalities and State, but this has not only been real starvation relief, but now is being seriously reduced. It is obvious therefore that only through insurance will the unemployed worker be secured in his livelihood.

The dropping of the older men in industry is a curse to the working class. In the shops, on the railroads, in the mines, the older workers are being discarded. The speed-up in the shops is terrific; the older workers, possessing skill and experience, no longer are needed, for the machine not only works faster, but has taken away a large part of the skill of the workers—not only in the shops, but even in the offices. The terrible speed-up and rationalization is leading to a multiplication of cases of industrial and occupational diseases. It is leading to increasing accidents. Facing the danger of unemployment, workers not only do not report accidents, but

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

return to work long before they are cured. Working women have been known to bear their children in the shops of this country. The working mother has no protection either before or after childbirth. This increases the anxiety of the working class family, especially at a time of childbirth.

It is clear, therefore, that provision must be made for all such situations, if the workers are to obtain security—and the demand for security is one of the deepest and furthest-reaching in the working class.

Part-time workers today frequently receive less in wages than workers obtaining relief—and at the same time they are being denied relief to make up for the loss. This is an intolerable situation, and leads to the degradation of the working class family. The Workers Unemployment Insurance Bill provides that part-time workers shall be entitled to the difference between their wages and the amount of relief to which a worker of the same category is entitled. Even more—full time workers today in many industries, especially the sweated industries, working like mad for long hours, receive less in wages than the relief recipients. Thus unemployment insurance, as one phase of social insurance, affects all sections of the workers.

What shall be the amount of the social insurance benefit? Shall we demand only sufficient to maintain bare existence? This raises the whole question of capitalism and the workers' hire. Shall the workers propose their own degradation, or shall they not as the victims of the capitalist system demand that 1) they receive decent wages for reasonable hours in the shops, so that they may bring up their families properly; and 2) if denied the right to work or to earn enough part-time, that the employers and the government provide them with the necessary assured income? Unquestionably the workers recognize their right to this demand.

In the performance of their work, the workers are injured in the factory; they are the victims of occupational diseases—thereby being deprived of their earning power. It is not correct to accept a mere pittance: this means to accept the capitalist charity position.

A worker deprived of the possibility of working, if through no fault of his own, has the right to his previous earning power. This should be determined on the basis of the average wages in the industry and territory. With wages down to the starvation level we cannot consent, for instance, that a textile worker earning $4 to $6 a week shall receive only the same amount in insurance. The United States Department of Labor declared only a short while ago that a working class family needs for food alone between $7.50

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to $10.25 a week. Other investigators demand a minimum of $1,800 for the workers' family. A minimum, therefore, for the working class family must be established in the insurance plan. This is provided in the demand for a minimum of $10 for each unemployed worker, plus $3 for each dependent.

The objection is raised that this is above the average of wages earned in the shop. Such objections are raised by those who, together with the rest of the workers, have submitted to the hunger budget provided by the municipal relief bureaus. This has led to a demoralization of the workers, and therefore the Unemployed Councils were correct in raising the question of the *Workers Relief Budget* around which the workers should and can be rallied for struggle.

Who should pay for the insurance? The government and the capitalists who are the beneficiaries of the present system. Social insurance should be considered as a first demand on capitalism—the right of the worker to security. The funds can be raised by taxes, the use of war funds and by means of a capital levy. Every worker will see the reasonableness of taking away a portion of the 60 billion dollars of wealth controlled by Morgan for the security of the millions of working class families during the entire period of idleness.

Nor should the worker consent to take strikebreaking jobs, or work below the standard of his trade. This would act against the whole spirit and need of unity of the working class.

The fund must be administered and controlled by commissions composed of workers. The graft and favoritism inevitably practiced by public institutions and politicians make it impossible for the workers to get a square deal in their suffering.

The struggle for social insurance must involve not only the unemployed workers. It affects the whole working class. The employed workers are equally affected: social insurance would afford them greater security against strikebreaking, thus encouraging them to put forward demands in the shops and to strike; it furnishes them with the necessary security in case of enforced idleness from the shop.

We have been negligent in the proposal of social insurance, in that we have brought forward only the unemployment phase of it, and have appealed mainly, if not solely, to the unemployed workers. This is an error, and the demand must now be taken into every shop, union and mass organization, and both the employed and unemployed workers be mobilized for it.

We must dissipate the idea that social insurance is only a slogan.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In the minds of many comrades it is a demand realizable only at the time of the revolution. This is a fallacy. Social insurance is an immediate demand, its realization depending on the degree to which we are able to mobilize the masses to struggle for it. Social insurance has been won through struggle in Europe. The form of it is not satisfactory, nor the amount of benefit. In many countries of Europe where unemployment insurance is in operation, the number of beneficiaries is being mercilessly reduced, the amount of benefit being slashed (Means Test in England, etc.). This the governments are putting through on the grounds of economy and with the aid of the social-democrats. A system of full social insurance such as in the Soviet Union will be possible only after the proletarian revolution, when working class lives and not profits will come first.

The struggle for social insurance therefore becomes a central task of the Party in the mobilization of the working class and all its sections for an immediate demand and in building up the forces for struggle against capitalism. Social insurance is a *unifying* slogan, uniting the employed and unemployed on an immediate need.

A campaign will be launched that must penetrate every shop, union, neighborhood and mass organization. In the form of petitions, referendums in the unions and mass organizations, through deputations to State and national institutions, demonstrations, etc., it must be made the central issue of the working class, particularly in face of the effects of the Industrial Recovery Act on the workers. It must be made a central demand of the election campaign and through it we should be able to penetrate sections of the working population that we have not reached before. Although more than 1,000 locals of the A. F. of L. have gone on record in support of the bill, this is hardly a beginning. The multitudinous fraternal organizations, reactionary in character but containing masses of workers, must be drawn in. The bill must be discussed in light of the Roosevelt promises, and the unemployment reserve bills proposed, and the treacherous action of the A. F. of L. and Socialist leaders be brought out. This will put the Party again into the leadership of the fight for social insurance, which, during the past year was challenged by the various other organizations that proposed fake bills.

To inaugurate this campaign, the notion and practice widespread among some of the lower functionaries and rank and file of the Party must be uprooted: the "distinction" between "Party" and "mass" work. *Mass work is Party work*, and there is no Party work which is not mass work. The whole Party membership must be mobilized; the Party fractions in the mass organizations must

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

draw the workers into participation. In the process of the struggle the Unemployed Councils must be built up, and the united front in the neighborhoods and lower mass organizations be extended. The Party will have to learn that unity depends in part of the development of the broadest democracy in the mass organizations, with the freest, democratic expression of opinion, making of decisions and carrying out of elections. In this process, the leading forces which are so badly needed for carrying on the struggle will come to the front. They must be cultivated and developed and the best elements be drawn into the Party and Y.C.L.

Unity cannot be established by resolutions and manifestoes. It will come only through struggle. The unified struggle of the masses, drawing ever larger sections of the workers into swing, will produce the mass pressure that will force the government to provide social insurance.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Imperialism and the Split in Socialism

By V. I. LENIN

IS there any connection between imperialism and that absolutely unparalleled victory which opportunism (in the form of social-chauvinism) has gained over the working-class movement in Europe?

This is the fundamental question of contemporary Socialism. It will only be possible and necessary to proceed to an analysis of this fundamental question after we have once and for all established in our Party literature; firstly, the imperialist character of our epoch and the present war; secondly, the indissoluble historical connection of social chauvinism with opportunism, and in like manner, the similarity of the content of their political ideas.

It is necessary to commence with as accurate and as complete a definition as possible. Imperialism is a particular historic stage of capitalism. Its particular features are threefold: Imperialism is 1) monopoly capitalism; 2) parasitic or decaying capitalism; 3) dying capitalism. The change from free competition to monopoly is the basic economic feature, the *essence* of imperialism. Monopoly manifests itself in five main aspects: 1) cartels, syndicates and trusts; concentration of production has reached such a stage that it has given birth to these monopolist associations of capitalists; 2) monopolist position of the big banks: three to five gigantic banks dominate the whole economic life of America, France, Germany; 3) seizure of the sources of *raw materials* by trusts and financial oligarchy (finance capital is monopolist industrial capital, which has fused with banking capital); 4) the division (economic) of the world by the international cartels *has commenced*. Such international cartels, ruling the *whole* world market and dividing it "amicably" until war re-distributes it—already amount to over a *hundred*. The export of capital, as an especially characteristic feature, as distinct from the export of commodities in the epoch of non-monopoly capitalism, stands in close relation to the economic and political—territorial division of the world. 5) The territorial division of the world (colonies) is *completed*.

Imperialism, as the highest stage of capitalism in America and Europe, and subsequently in Asia, became fully developed in the period 1898-1914. The Spanish-American war of 1898, the Anglo-Boer war (1900-1902), the Russo-Japanese war (1904-1905) and the economic crisis in Europe in 1920 — these are the chief historical landmarks of this new epoch in the history of the world.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

That imperialism is parasitic or decaying capitalism is shown, in the first place, in the tendency to decay, which distinguishes *every* monopoly under the private ownership of the means of production. The difference between the republican, democratic and the reactionary monarchist bourgeoisie disappears precisely because both are rotting alive (which in no way does away with the amazingly rapid development of capitalism in various spheres of industry, in different countries, at various periods). Secondly, the decay of capitalism manifests itself in the creation of a huge section of rentiers, capitalists, who live by clipping coupons. In each of the four foremost imperialist countries, England, America, France and Germany, capital in securities comprises 100-150 billion francs, which means a yearly revenue of not less than 5-8 billions per country. Thirdly, the export of capital has the effect of multiplying parasitism by itself. Fourthly, "finance capital strives towards domination, and not towards freedom." Political reaction along the *whole* line—is the essence of imperialism. Bribery, corruption to a gigantic degree. Panama scandals of every kind. Fifthly, the exploitation of oppressed nations, indissolubly bound up with annexations, and the especial exploitation of the colonies by a handful of "great" powers, increasingly transforms the "civilized" world into a parasite on the body of millions of uncivilized peoples. The Roman proletariat lived at the expense of society. Present day society lives at the expense of the modern proletariat. Marx particularly emphasized this profound remark of Sismondi. Imperialism to some degree changes this. To a certain extent, a privileged section of the proletariat of the imperialist powers lives at the expense of hundreds of millions of uncivilized peoples.

It is evident why imperialism is *dying* capitalism, transitional to Socialism: monopoly, growing out of capitalism, is *already* the dying of capitalism, the beginning of its going over to Socialism. The gigantic *socialization* of labor by imperialism (which its apologists, the bourgeois economists, call "interlacing") means the same thing.

In putting forward this definition of imperialism we differ completely from Karl Kautsky, who, it appears, sees in imperialism a "phase of capitalism" and defines imperialism as a *policy* "preferred" by finance capital; as a striving of "industrial" countries to annex "agrarian countries."[1] Kautsky's definition is absolutely false the-

[1] Imperialism is the product of highly developed industrial capitalism. It consists in the tendency of every industrial capitalist nation more and more to subordinate or to bring under their control all the big *agrarian* regions irrespective of what nations inhabit those regions. (Kautsky's article "Imperialism," published in the *New Times* [*Neue Zeit*], No. 21, September 11, 1914.)

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

oretically. The particular feature of imperialism is precisely the domination, *not* of industrial but of finance capital, the tendency towards annexations, *not* only of agrarian, but of *all* countries. Kautsky isolates the *policy* of imperialism from its economics; isolates monopoly in politics from monopoly in economics, in order to clear the way for his trivial bourgeois reformism, such as "disarmament," "ultra-imperialism" and similar nonsense. The aim of this theoretical falsehood is wholly designed to hide the *deepest* contradictions in imperialism, and so justify the theory of "unity" with the apologists of imperialism, with frank social-chauvinists and opportunists.

The proletariat is an offspring of capitalism—world capitalism, not merely European, and not only imperialist. On a world scale —50 years earlier or 50 years later, from the point of view of *this* scale the question is a special one—the "proletariat" of course, "will be" united, and "inevitably" revolutionary social democracy will be victorious amongst the proletariat. That is not the point, Messrs. Kautskians. The point is that now, in the imperialist countries of Europe, *you* are the *lackeys* of the opportunists, who are alien to the proletariat, as a class, who are the servants, agents, and transmitters of the influence of the bourgeoisie, and unless it is *rid of you* the labor movement remains a *bourgeois labor movement.* Your propaganda for "unity" with the opportunists, with Legien and David, Plekhanov or Chkhenkeli or Potresov, etc., is objectively a defense of the *enslavement* of the workers by the imperialist bourgeoisie aided by its best agents in the working-class movement. The victory of revolutionary social democracy on a world scale is absolutely inevitable, but it is coming and will come, it is being consummated and will be consummated *against* you and will be victorious *over* you.

Those two tendencies, yes even *two* parties in the modern working-class movement, which so manifestly parted company throughout the whole world in 1914-1916, were carefully *traced by Engels and Marx in England* through several decades, approximately from 1858—1892.

Neither Marx nor Engels lived to see the imperialist epoch of world capitalism, which first began in the years 1898-1900. But the peculiarity of England was that already from the middle of the 19th century, at least *two* outstanding features of imperialism were present: 1) immense colonies and 2) monopoly profit (due to its monopolist position on the world market). In both connections England was then an exception amongst the capitalist countries, and Engels together with Marx in analyzing this exception, absolutely clearly and definitely pointed out its *relation* to the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

temporary victory of opportunism in the English working-class movement.

In a letter to Marx, dated October 7, 1858, Engels wrote:

> "The English proletariat actually becomes more and more bourgeoisified, so that this most bourgeois of all nations apparently desires to bring matters to such a pass as to have a bourgeois aristocracy and bourgeois proletariat *side by side* with the bourgeoisie. Obviously, this is to a certain extent, well calculated, on the part of a nation which is exploiting the world."

In a letter to Sorge dated September 21, 1872, Engels informs him that Hales made a terrific row in the Federal Council of the International and "secured a vote of censure on Marx, for his words that the English labor leaders had sold themselves."

Marx writes to Sorge on April 4, 1874:

> "As regards the urban workers here (in England) one is forced to regret that the whole band of leaders don't get into Parliament. This would be the surest way of getting rid of this mob."

Engels, in a letter to Marx, dated August 11, 1881, talks of "the worst of the English trade unions, which allow themselves to be ruled by the people, bought over by the bourgeoisie, or at any rate, paid by it." In a letter to Kautsky dated September 12, 1882, Engels wrote:

> "You ask me, what the English workers think about colonial policy? Precisely the same as they think of politics generally. Here there is no working class party, there are only Conservative and Liberal radicals, and the workers freely enjoy with them the fruits of the colonial monopoly of England and its monopoly of the world market."

In a letter of April 19, 1890, he says:

> "The movement (of the working class in England) proceeding under the surface, embraces ever wider sections, the great majority of whom have been the hitherto motionless *lowest* (emphasis Engels') masses, and the day is not far off, when this mass *will discover itself*, when it will see clearly that it alone is that colossal moving mass."

On March 4, 1891, he writes: "With the failure of the disrupted Dockers' Union, the 'old' conservative trade unions, *rich* and, therefore, cowardly, remain alone on the field of battle. . . ." On September 14, 1891, at the Newcastle Trade Union Congress the old unionists, opponents of the eight hour day, were defeated "and the bourgeois newspapers admit the defeat of the *bourgeois labor party*." (All italics are Engels'.)

These ideas of Engels, repeated in the course of a decade, were

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

also expressed by him publicly, in the press, as is proved by his preface to the second edition (1892) of *The Condition of the Working Class in England*. Here mention is made of "the aristocracy among the working class," of "the privileged minority of the workers," in contrast to the "wide masses of the workers." "A small, privileged, 'protected' minority" of the working class, were the only ones who "permanently benefited" from the privileged position of England in 1848-1868; "the great bulk of them experienced but a temporary improvement of their conditions," . . . "With the breakdown of England's industrial monopoly, the English working class will lose that privileged position." The membership of the "New Unionism," unions of unskilled workers, "had this immense advantage, that *their minds were virgin soil*, entirely free from inherited 'respectable' bourgeois prejudices, which hampered the brains of the better situated 'old' unionists." . . ."So-called workers' representatives" is the title given to people in England, "who are forgiven their position as workers because they would rather drown themselves in the ocean of liberalism."

We have taken these fairly detailed extracts from Marx and Engels, in order that readers might become fully acquainted with them. Not only is it essential to become acquainted with them but it is worth while paying deep attention to them. Because here is the *key* to those tactics in the working-class movement, which are dictated by the objective conditions of the imperialist epoch.

Already here, Kautsky has endeavored to "trouble the waters" and to substitute for Marxism, sugar-coated conciliation with the opportunists. Polemizing with the frank and naive social-imperialists (like Lensch) who justify the war from the standpoint of Germany, as the destruction of England's monopoly, Kautsky "corrects" this obvious falsehood by another one, just as obviously false. In the place of a cynical falsehood, he uses a sugar-coated one! The *industrial* monopoly of England has long been broken, he says; it has long been destroyed. There is nothing more that can or need to be destroyed.

Wherein lies the falsity in this argument?

Firstly, the *colonial* monopoly of England is ignored. And Engels, as we have seen, already in 1882, 34 years ago, quite clearly directed attention to it. Even if England's industrial monopoly has been destroyed, its colonial monopoly not only remains, but is extraordinarily increased, for the whole world has already been divided. By means of his sugar-coated lies, Kautsky smuggles through a bourgeois pacifist and opportunist philistine idea, to the effect that "well, there's nothing to wage war about." On the contrary, not only is there something for the *capitalists* to fight for now, but it is *impossible not* to fight, if they desire to retain capi-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

talism, for without a forcible redistribution of the colonies, the *new* imperialist countries cannot obtain those privileges which the older (*and less strong*) imperialist countries enjoy.

Secondly, why does England's monopoly explain the (temporary) victory of opportunism in England? Because, monopoly yields *super-profit*, i.e., a surplus of profit above that capitalist profit which is normal and usual throughout the world. From this super-profit the capitalists *are able* to set aside a portion (and by no means a small one) in order to bribe *their* workers, to create something similar to a union, (recollect the famous "alliances" of the English trade unions with their masters, described by the Webbs) the union of the workers of this particular nation with their masters *against* the other countries. The industrial monopoly of England was destroyed even at the end of the 19th century. This is indisputable. But *how* did this destruction take place? Is it true, that all monopoly disappeared?

If this were so, then Kautsky's "theory" of conciliation (with opportunism) would have a certain amount of justification. But the fact is, that it is *not* so. Imperialism is monopoly capitalism. Every cartel, trust, syndicate, every gigantic big bank is a monopoly. Super-profit has not disappeared. It has remained. The exploitation of every country by a single privileged, financially rich one, persists, and has strengthened. A handful of rich countries—in all there are four, if one speaks of independent and really gigantic "modern" wealth; England, France, U.S.A., and Germany; this handful has developed monopoly to an immeasurable degree; and receives super-profit to the extent of hundreds of millions, even billions; it "rides on the back" of hundreds and hundreds of millions of people in other countries, and it fights among itself for the division of that booty which is the most luxurious, most plentiful, and the easiest to get.

This is the economic and political essence of imperialism, the profound contradictions of which Kautsky covers up, instead of exposing.

The bourgeoisie of a "great" imperialist power is economically in a position to bribe the higher sections of "its" workers, expending on this a hundred or so million francs a year, since its super-profit comprises undoubtedly, nearly a billon. It is of *secondary* importance as to how this small bribe is divided amongst the labor ministers, "the workers' representatives" (remember Engels' splendid analysis of this conception), the labor participants in the war industry committees, labor officials, workers, organized in narrow craft unions, employees and so on.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

During the period 1848-68 and for a short time afterwards, England alone enjoyed a monopoly; therefore, opportunism was victorious for decades; there were no other countries with rich colonies or with industrial monopolies.

The last third of the 19th century was a transition to the new imperialist epoch. Monopoly is enjoyed by the finance capital, not of one, but of a limited few great powers. (In Japan and Russia there is a monopoly of military power, limitless territories, or the special advantage for robbing the natives of China and others which partly supplements, partly takes the place of the monopoly of modern present-day finance capital). Due to this difference for decades, England's monopoly *could* remain *unchallenged*. The monopoly of present-day finance capital is being hotly challenged; the epoch of imperialist war has commenced. Formerly the working class of *one* country could be bribed, corrupted for decades. Now this is unlikely, even impossible, but on the other hand *every* imperialist "great" power, can and does bribe *smaller* (compared with England in 1848-68) sections of the "labor aristocracy." During that period, a "*bourgeois labor party*" according to the splendidly profound expression used by Engels, could be formed only in one country because it alone enjoyed monopoly, but for that matter lasting for a long time. Now a "*bourgeois labor party*" is *unavoidable* and typical for all imperialist countries, but in view of their desperate struggle for the division of the booty, it is unlikely that such a party could for long be victorious in a number of countries. For the masses of the proletariat and semi-proletariat are more and more crushed, oppressed, tortured and harried by the trusts, financial oligarchy and high prices, *which make it possible* to bribe a handful of their higher sections.

On the one hand, there is the tendency of the bourgeoisie and the opportunists, to turn a handful of the richest, privileged nations into "eternal" parasites on the body of the rest of humanity, "to rest on the laurels" of the exploitation of the Negroes, Indians, etc., keeping them in subjection with the assistance of the well-equipped destructive technique of modern militarism. On the other hand, the tendency of the *masses*, more oppressed than formerly and bearing all the tortures of imperialist wars, is to throw off that yoke, to overthrow the bourgeoisie. The history of the labor movement will from now on inevitably unfold itself in the struggle between these two tendencies. For the first tendency is not accidental, but has its economic "basis." The bourgeoisie has already begotten, nurtured and made sure of for itself, the "bourgeois labor parties" of the social chauvinists, in *all* countries. The difference, for instance, between the already formed party of Bissolati in Italy, a

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

party wholly social-imperialist, and, let us say, a partially-formed semi-party, of the Potresovs, Gvozdevs, Bulkins, Chkheidzes, Skobelevs and Co.—is immaterial. The important thing is that the economic breaking away of a section of the labor aristocracy to the bourgeoisie has developed and become completed, and whatever its political form, this economic fact, this shifting in the relations between the classes, can be found without special effort.

On the economic basis indicated, the political institutions of modern capitalism—press, parliament, trade unions, congresses, etc., have created, corresponding to the economic privileges and bribes for respectful, meek, reformist and patriotic employees and workers, *political* privileges and bribes. Lucrative and peaceful berths in the ministries, or the war industry committees, in parliament and in various commissions, on the editorial staffs of "solid" legal newspapers, or in the administration of no less solid and "bourgeois-abiding" labor unions—this is how the imperialist bourgeoisie attracts and rewards the representatives and supporters of the "bourgeois labor parties."

The mechanics of political democracy act in the same direction. You *can't get on* without elections in our time. You cannot get along without the masses; and in this period of the printing press and parliamentarism it is *impossible* to make the masses follow you without a widely ramified, systematically conducted, well-equipped system of flattery, lies, fraud, of juggling with fashionable and popular words, of promising right and left any kind of reforms, and *any* blessings to the workers, if only they will give up revolutionary struggle for the overthrow of the bourgeoisie. I would call this system, Lloyd-Georgism, after one of the most advanced and slick representatives of this system in the classical country of the "bourgeois labor party," the English minister, Lloyd George. A first-class bourgeois manipulator and political shark, a popular orator, able to deliver all sorts of speeches, even r-r-revolutionary speeches before a workers' audience, capable of giving considerable gifts to the obedient workers in the shape of social reforms (insurance, etc.), Lloyd George serves the bourgeoisie splendidly.[2] He serves the bourgeoisie precisely amongst the workers, transmits its influence *precisely* to the proletariat, there, where it is most needed and where it is most difficult of all to subordinate the masses morally to the bourgeoisie.

And is there a great difference between Lloyd George and the

[2] Recently in an English journal I came across an article by a Tory, a political opponent of Lloyd George's, entitled "Lloyd George from the point of view of a Tory." The war had opened the eyes of this opponent to a realization of what an excellent assistant of the bourgeoisie this Lloyd George is! The Tories have made peace with him!

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Scheidemanns, Legiens, Hendersons and Hyndmanns, the Plekhanovs, Renaudels and Co.? Some will argue that from the latter, some will return to the revolutionary Socialism of Marx. This is impossible, but it is an insignificant difference in degree, if we consider the question on a political, i.e., mass scale. Individual figures from the present-day social chauvinist leaders may return to the proletariat. But the social chauvinist *tendency* or (what amounts to the same thing) the opportunist tendency, neither disappears nor "returns" to the revolutionary proletariat. Wherever Marxism is popular amongst the workers, this political current, this "bourgeois labor party" will swear by the name of Marx. We cannot prevent them from doing this, just as it is impossible to prohibit a trading firm using any label, any sign, any advertisement. It has always happened in history, that after the death of revolutionary leaders popular amongst the oppressed classes, their enemies attempted to utilize their names, for the deception of the oppressed classes.

The fact is, that "bourgeois labor parties" as a political phenomenon, have already formed themselves in *all* the advanced capitalist countries, that without a determined, merciless struggle all along the line, against these parties, or, it is the same thing, against groups, tendencies, &c., there can be no talk of a struggle against imperialism, or of Marxism, or of a Socialist labor movement. Chkheidze's fraction, *Nashe Dielo* (Our Cause), *The Voice of Labor* (Golos Truda), and the supporters of the Organizing Committees[3] abroad, are nothing but varieties of one or the other of such parties. There is not the slightest reason to believe that these parties could disappear *before* the social revolution. On the contrary, the nearer the revolution, the more powerful will it develop, the more sudden and violent the transitions and jumps from one stage to another in its process, the greater will be the struggle inside the labor movement, of the revolutionary mass stream against opportunist philistinism. Kautskianism represents no independent current, having no roots either in the masses or in the privileged section which went over to the bourgeoisie. The danger of Kautskianism is that, utilizing the ideology of the past, it energetically attempts to reconcile the proletariat with the "bourgeois labor parties" to maintain their unity, and in this way raise the authority of the latter. Open social chauvinists are not followed by the masses

[3] The Organizing Committee formed inside the Russian Social Democratic Labor Party, arose as the leading organ of the August bloc of 1912, which was created by the Menshevik fraction for struggle with the Bolsheviks. The war divided its members amongst various tendencies of social-patriotism and "platonic internationalism," the representative of which was the Foreign Secretariat of the Organizing Committee. (Ed.)

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

any longer. Lloyd George was hissed at workers' meetings in England; Hyndemann left the party; the Renaudels and Scheidemanns, Potresovs and Gvozdevs are protected by the police. The concealed defence of social chauvinism by the Kautskians is the most dangerous thing of all.

One of the most widely spread sophisms of Kautskianism consists in their references to the "masses." We do not want, they say, to break away from the masses and mass organizations. But consider how Engels approached this question. The "mass organization" of the English trade unions in the nineteenth century was on the side of the bourgeois labor party. Marx and Engels did not reconcile themselves to it on these grounds, but exposed it. They did not forget firstly that the trade union organizations directly embraced a *minority of the proletariat*. In England then, as in Germany now, no more than one-fifth of the proletariat are members of organizations. One cannot seriously imagine that under capitalism it is possible to include in organizations the majority of the proletariat; secondly, and this is the main point, it is not so much a question of how many members there are in an organization, what is the real objective meaning of its politics; whether these politics represent the masses, whether they serve the masses, i.e., the liberation of the masses from capitalism, or whether it represents the interest of the minority, its conciliation with capitalism. It was specifically the latter which was true for England in the 19th century, and is true for Germany, etc., today.

Engels distinguishes between the "bourgeois labor party" of the *old* trade unions, a privileged minority, and the "lowest masses," the real majority. Engels appeals to the latter, which is *not* infected with "bourgeois respectability." This is the essence of Marxian tactics.

We cannot — nor can anybody, calculate beforehand what section of the proletariat follows and will follow the social chauvinists and opportunists. Only the struggle will reveal this; it will be definitely decided only by the social revolution. But we know, quite undubitably, that the "defenders of the fatherland" in the imperialist war represent only a minority. It is our duty, therefore, if we wish to remain socialists, to go *lower* and *deeper* to the real masses; this is the meaning and content of the struggle against opportunism. Exposing the fact that the opportunists and social chauvinists in reality betray and sell out the interests of the masses, that they defend the temporary privileges of a minority of the workers, that they are transmitting bourgeois ideas and influence, that in practice they are allies and agents of the bourgeoisie, we thereby

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

teach the masses to recognize their real political interests, to fight for Socialism and the revolution throughout all the long and painful vicissitudes of imperialist wars and imperialist armed truces.

To explain to the masses the inevitability and the necessity for breaking with opportunism, to educate them for the revolution by a merciless struggle with opportunism, to utilise the experiences of the war in order to unmask the whole repulsiveness of national liberal labor politics, and not to cover them up—that is the only Marxian line in the working class movement of the world.

"Social chauvinism is adherence to the idea of "defending the fatherland" in the present war. . . The social chauvinists follow the bourgeoisie in deceiving the people by saying that the war is conducted for the defence of the freedom and the existence of the nations, thus they put themselves on the side of the bourgeoisie against the proletariat."—*Lenin.*

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Intensification of the Versailles Antagonisms and the Menace of the New Imperialist War

By N. RUDOLPH

THE distinguishing feature of the present-day international situation is the extreme intensification of the antagonisms between the imperialist governments, which has "led to the danger of a new world imperialist war." (Thesis of the Twelfth Plenum of the E. C. C. I.)

Some observers are fond of comparing the present international situation with the period immediately preceding the beginning of the world imperialist war in 1914. Like the present time, they say, the years of 1913-14 were years of general tenseness in Europe, when the keenest social conflicts were developing in a number of countries and the wave of the workers' movement had risen high—in Russia there was a mass strike movement accompanied by big barricade fights, in Great Britain there was an enormous strike movement, the Irish conflict, etc. At the same time, relations between the imperialist powers had become terrifically strained—in Russia, Great Britain, France and Germany a frantic armament race was going on and the shots at Sarajevo were merely one of the many possible sparks which could have taken place in the atmosphere of extreme electric tenseness which ruled in Europe at the time.

Such a comparison appears to us to be utterly inadequate. In contradiction to the pre-war period, the world has entered into the epoch of the general crisis of capitalism, and the present contradictions of imperialism are developing on this general crisis, becoming intensified by the world economic crisis, the end of the relative stabilization of capitalism, the existence of the Soviet Union, which has successfully completed the Five-Year Plan in four years, the upsurge of the revolutionary movement in the countries of capitalism, in the colonies and the semi-colonies and the war of Japan against China which has already been going on for almost two years. As the consequence we have a number of peculiar results. Firstly, *the present-day imperialist contradictions on some sectors (Germany, France and its allies, Italy, Jugo-Slavia) are much more intense than in* 1913-14. Secondly, *the contradictions between the imperialist*

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

powers are developing with extreme irregularity, in accordance with the increasing inequality in the development of capitalism. Thirdly, *in the process of the struggle between the imperialists, groups are formed which are extremely unstable.* Fourthly, *in international relations there rules a hitherto unprecedented chaos* corresponding to the chaos caused by the world economic crisis in the world economy of capitalism. Finally, *the whole development is extremely dynamic and fraught with catastrophic changes.*

It is sufficient to examine international relations for the last year to realize this analysis is well founded. It was only in June-July last year that Herriot and MacDonald at Lausanne put their signatures to the now widely known Anglo-French "pact of confidence," the essence of which was the fixing of a common line of action for British and French imperialism on the basic questions of international policy (the question of international debts to America, relations with Germany, the Far East conflict, disarmament, etc.). It would seem to be a return to the Anglo-French Entente and the consolidation of an Anglo-French imperialist bloc against America, Germany and the U.S.S.R. Less than nine months have passed since that time, but not a trace remains of the "pact of confidence." With respect to Germany, France stands at the head of the so-called anti-revisionist bloc, while Britain has come much nearer to the supporters of revision of the Versailles Treaty. On the question of inter-allied debts, the paths of France and Britain have diverged, possibly only temporarily, but nevertheless they have separated.

A particularly clear picture of the chaos in international relations and the sharpness of imperialist contradictions is given by the Disarmament Conference. In a brief period, it received 57 plans for "disarmament" which, like all those which had come previously, were doomed to failure. At the conference various groupings of countries were constantly formed and dissolved—the positions of the representatives of capitalist countries on various questions are sometimes completely contradictory to those they held yesterday.

The advent of the most militant German nationalism to power in Germany in the person of the Hitler government has still further intensified the antagonisms of imperialisms. The Hitler government, which is bringing the open terrorist Fascist dictatorship of the German bourgeoisie into existence, is a bloc of the most reactionary part of finance capital, the East Prussian landlords, the old militarist bureaucracy of the Kaiser and the mass Fascist national Socialist Party, which, with the aid of extreme nationalist demagogy supplied a petty bourgeois basis for the Fascist dictatorship. The advent of this government to power urgently raised the question of the fate of the post-war Versailles system, which was already crack-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing under the blows of the crisis and the growing resistance of the German toiling masses to the Versailles oppression. National Socialism made use of the uncontrollable strivings of these masses to struggle against the Versailles system, promising them liberation from the oppression of this system and thus evoked in Germany an upsurge of nationalism and chauvinism such as could not help but cause the greatest alarm to the bourgeoisie of the victorious countries regarding the inviolability of their gains. On the other hand, on the tide of this chauvinist upsurge in Germany, there came to power those elements of Kaiserist Germany which are protagonists of the idea of "revanche" and which in practice carry out the demand of the German bourgeoisie for the further arming of the country. And though this signalizes to the imperialists of France, Britain, Poland, etc., the strengthening of German neo-imperialism, of their rival in the struggle for the partition and repartition of the world, in the eyes of the toiling masses of the whole world rise vivid pictures of those who, in 1918, forced the bandit Brest peace treaty on Soviet Russia.

This is why *in that atmosphere of Europe which was already strained to the extreme, saturated with electricity as before a war, the coming of Hitler to power not only sharpened all the imperialist contradictions but directly placed the question of war on the order of the day.* The feelings which have arisen in this connection in France were very vividly characterized in the correspondence of the Paris correspondent of the *Frankfurter Zeitung* on February 14, 1933, when he wrote:

> "It is terrible, but it must be said that owing to all these seeming symptoms, *the danger of war is seriously spoken of here.* Of course, this is not the first time in the last twenty years, but this world is linked up with Germany. But we can guarantee that *never since* 1926 *have the French used this terrible word with such seriousness as now.*"

Such sentiments are now dominant also in the countries of Eastern and South Eastern Europe. The bourgeois press of Poland, Jugo-Slavia, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, etc., speak all the time of the tremendously growing danger of a new war. The formula of the inevitability of a new war has become an accepted term, even in the mouths of the social democrats, who claimed, not so long ago, that the world war was the "last war." In this spirit, for example, the well-known Latvian social-democrat, Zelens, late foreign minister of Latvia spoke recently with the greatest clarity.

The basic reason of all these moods is, of course, not the nationalist anti-Versailles demagogy of Hitler, in whose seriousness the imperialists have little faith. The basic reason is in general

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the conviction that *it is impossible to maintain the Versailles system intact, that in particular there must inevitably be a revision of the territorial boundaries in post-Versailles Europe, and finally, that the imperialist antagonisms connected with all this cannot be solved peacefully.*

The revision of the Versailles system began in reality long before Hitler came into power. Under the blows of the economic crisis crumbled the regular "final" plan for regulating the reparations question, the Young plan, which was accepted not long ago by the German bourgeoisie as its greatest achievement. Reparation payments were in practice annulled in 1931 with the declaration of the Hoover moratorium, and the world crisis is responsible for this and not the German bourgeoisie and its government of Bruening and von Papen, who made the formal arrangements for the actual liquidation of reparations.

The question of German armaments, of the so-called "equal rights" of Germany in the sphere of armaments was raised even by General von Schleicher when he was war minister. Under the pressure of the nationalist wave in Germany and faced with the actually commencing arming of Germany, France and Britain were compelled to recognize in words this "equality of rights" for Germany. MacDonald went even further. He proposed in his "disarmament" plan to double the numbers of the German Reichswehr, i.e., to increase it to 200,000 men on condition that the period of service was cut down. In practice, of course, all this is of insignificant importance. It is a fact that in Germany a powerful militarist apparatus has begun to be formed—the military fascist "Steel Helmets" (250,000 men) and the National-Socialist storm troops (400-500,000 men), who are arming and training either under the pretense of "auxiliary police" or without any concealment. A ministry of aviation has been formed, etc. Faced with all these facts, French imperialism and its allies are found to be utterly helpless. No diplomatic protests and demarches can stop the arming of Germany. It can only be stopped by a preventive war against Germany, but at the present day, neither France nor Poland can make up their mind to this step. And meanwhile there has begun in practice the undermining of the military hegemony of France and its allies which was built up after the world war.

To sum up, *the question of the fate of the Versailles system has been converted by the whole course of events into a question of the revision of the post-Versailles boundaries.* Not only the frontiers of Germany are in question, not only the Polish corridor and Upper Silesia (although this is a decisive question), but all the post-Versailles frontiers. The treaties of Versailles, St. Germain, Trianon, etc., handed over millions of Germans by force to Czecho-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Slovakia, millions of Hungarians to Rumania and Czecho-Slovakia, united to Jugo-Slavia the more cultured provinces of Horvatia and Slovenia, which groan under the yoke of Great Serbian dictatorship. Finally, these treaties doomed to a pitiful existence "independent" Austria, depriving six million Austrian-Germans of the right of joining Germany ("Anschluss") and handing them over to the servitude of Entente capital. This is what is spoken of when the question arises of revising boundaries. This is why even the raising of the question of the Polish Corridor and Danzig will inevitably lead to an outburst of antagonisms connected with the struggle for the re-moulding of Central and South-Eastern Europe, i.e., raising the question of separating Horvatia and Slovenia from Serbia, of Transylvania, Banat, the Hungarian part of Slovenia, the "Anschluss" of Austria, etc. The acuteness of this whole question is increased further by the fact that not only Germany, Hungary, Austria and Bulgaria, which were defeated in the world war, are interested in the revision of post-war frontiers, but Italy also, which is trying to weaken the French military bloc and, above all, its immediate rival in the Balkans—Jugo-Slavia.

Can it be imagined that all these acute antagonisms can be solved peacefully? Can it be imagined that Poland will relinquish the Danzig Corridor or Upper Silesia, the metallurgy of which is the basis of the Polish war industry, to Germany without a struggle, or even without war? Can we suppose that without war Rumania will give up to Hungary considerable parts of Transylvania, that Jugo-Slavia will abandon Banata, that Czecho-Slovakia will give up the Hungarian part of Slovakia, or that the Great Serbian bourgeoisie will consent without a most bloody war to the separation of Horvatia, Slovenia, Bosnia and Montenegro, to satisfy the appetite of Italian imperialism?

We cannot suppose such things, of course. It is true that various agreements between various countries are quite possible, the more so that attempts are being made to tempt Poland and other countries with compensation for the possible territorial losses, at the expense of the Soviet Union (Ukraine) or Lithuania, but all these antagonisms cannot be radically solved peacefully. *There has never been a case in the history of the world when the partition of any part of it was carried on by diplomatic methods and not by a bloody war. This is why the spectre of a bloody war is assuming real substance. This is why the qustion of the danger of a new war has taken its place on the order of the day of European politics.*

The intensification of imperialist antagonisms in Europe, and the raising of the question of the revision of the post-Versailles frontiers have increased many times the frantic armament race.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In France, a plan is being hurriedly carried out to reorganize the whole army with the aim of strengthening its offensive powers, new forts are being constructed on the German frontier and naval construction is being increased. The German papers openly accuse Poland of concentrating troops in the Corridor. In Poland itself, the generals, the parliamentarians and "Socialists" call from the tribune of the Seim and in the press for an increase in the preparedness of the Polish army for war. In some circles there is even talk of the possibility of a preventive war on Germany with the aim of administering a military defeat to the latter before German armaments have become a genuine reality. In the same way, feverish armament is taking place in all the countries of the Little Entente.

But the matter is not limited merely to armaments. Faced with the ever greater disintegration of the Versailles system, the small states of Europe are striving to unite their forces to increase their resistance to a revision of territorial boundaries. These strivings are stimulated still more by the growing distrust of the small countries in the policy of the big powers, whose tendency to make territorial concessions to Germany at the expense of the small countries (Poland and the Little Entente) is becoming more and more obvious. Not very long ago Czecho-Slovakia, Rumania and Jugo-Slavia, which were even previously united in the Little Entente, made a new *"organizational pact," which was practically a military alliance, directed against the revisionist aims of Germany and Hungary and especially against the imperialist aims of Italy.* In addition, this pact is a peculiar kind of insurance of these countries against possible agreements between the great powers and Germany at their expense. It is intended to make the Little Entente more independent of any changes in the foreign policy of the chief guardian of the Versailles system—French imperialism.

At the same time, the tendency of Poland to an active rapproachment with the Little Entente is noticeable. Up till *now*, Poland was averse to such a rapproachment because it would inevitably worsen its relations with Hungary and Italy, against which above all the Little Entente was formed. Moreover, Poland needed good relations with Hungary and Italy very greatly in case of war against the U.S.S.R. At the present day, the intensity of imperialist antagonisms has so greatly sharpened that in spite of these considerations, Poland finds itself compelled to make a far-reaching rapproachment with Czecho-Slovakia and Jugo-Slavia, which is reflected in the statements of the European press on the signing of a Polish-Czech-Slovakian military convention and also in the demonstrative resignation of the newly appointed Polish ambassador to Rome, Pototski.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Finally, Poland is increasingly working on the formation of a Baltic Alliance between Poland, Latvia, Esthonia and Lithuania. This aim meets with complete sympathy from Latvia and Esthonia, while the Latvian Social-Democrats (Zelens, etc.), openly advocate a military alliance with Poland, on the pretense of the danger from Hitler. The policy of forming a Baltic alliance, however, encounters the resistance of Fascist Lithuania, which sets itself the main task of a struggle for the return of Vilna, which was seized from it by Poland.

And so the preparations for a new war proceed in all directions. *The feverish armament race is supplemented by an equally feverish building up of military blocs.* In all countries, and first of all in Germany, the terror against the working class is assuming a monstrous extent. Simultaneously, in a number of countries even the pacifist petty-bourgeois organizations are being broken up. Finance capital and the military circles are trying to remove any resistance to a new war in advance and assure the unhampered development of all the preparations for war.

The imperialists see the danger of a sudden outburst of the antagonisms of the Versailles system and the rise of a new imperialist war with the greatest clearness. At the same time they see the whole danger for imperialism of such a military outbreak. A new war threatens first of all to destroy the relationship of forces between the imperialist powers which has taken form on the basis of a whole system of peace treaties. It threatens to put the national colonial question on the order of the day, not only in the sense of a new and inevitable redivision of the colonies as the result of war, but also in the sense of a tremendous increase in the centrifugal tendencies and the national independence movement in the big colonial empires, and above all in the British empire, whose contacts with the dominions (Canada, Australia and South Africa) have greatly weakened in recent years. And chief of all, the experience of the world imperialist war, not only in the defeated countries but in France and Great Britain, makes the imperialists fear the danger that the Communist slogan of converting imperialist war into civil war will be put into effect. This fear is increased still further by the realization that alongside the capitalist world there exists the mighty Soviet Union, the bulwark and the basis of the world proletariat.

All this together leads to some of the *leading imperialist politicians using every effort to avoid war between the imperialist powers, to find methods even for temporary elimination of imperialist antagonisms with the aim of creating a united anti-Soviet bloc for new intervention in the U.S.S.R.* War against the U.S.S.R.,

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for the destruction of the proletarian state and for the division of the so-called "Russian inheritance" is the line along which the imperialists see a way out of the world economic crisis, and out of the imperialist antagonisms which are irritating the capitalist world. These gentlemen hope to satisfy the appetites of the dissatisfied states and those inclined to revisionism at the expense of the U.S.S.R., at the expense of the territory forming the Soviet Union (Ukraine, Far East, etc.).

The attempts of Mussolini and MacDonald to form a new "European Directory" by means of a four-power pact (England, Italy, France and Germany) are precisely designed to switch over the anti-war intenseness of modern Europe on to increased and accelerated praparations for war against the U.S.S.R. The coming of Hitler to power in Germany not only means an intensification of the imperialist antagonisms in Europe, but it also means a strengthening of the anti-Soviet line of the German bourgeoisie. In his book *My Fight,* Hitler develops the task of the anti-Soviet policy of the German bourgeoisie in detail. The chief specialist of the National-Socialists on foreign policy, Alfred Rosenberg, emphasizes more vividly still in his literary works that German Fascism sets itself the task of a struggle against the Soviet Union and for the partition of its territory. The plan of foreign policy of the National-Socialists is as follows: Germany, Great Britain and Italy must make an alliance for a joint struggle against the U.S.S.R. Poland must be cut off by handing over the Corridor to Germany and separating West Ukraine from it. The Soviet Union must be dismembered. Soviet Ukraine together with West Ukraine must be converted into an "independent" bourgeois state under the aegis of Germany. The remaining bourgeois Russia must open up Siberia for German colonization and enterprise. Poland can eventually be compensated by handing over to it part or all of Lithuania, if in general victorious Germany does not try to swallow up Poland and the Baltic States as it tried at the time of the Brest Litovsk treaty.

The foregoing political conception of the National-Socialists thus opens up for British imperialism a certain field for combinations by which an anti-Soviet bloc can temporarily be knocked together. MacDonald and Baldwin understand, of course, that there is fantasy in the above-mentioned plans, but a certain part can be accepted, and Fascist Germany can be chiefly utilised for anti-Soviet combinations. For this purpose it is necessary to obtain consent from France and its allies to the revision of post-Versailles frontiers. Germany must receive the minimum territorial concessions which would permit it to enter the united capitalist bloc. The small governments—the Little Entente and Poland—must

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

make certain sacrifices, so to speak, in the name of the general class interests of imperialism. This is the essence of the idea of the "European Directory" and the four-power pact.

The contents of the Mussolini-MacDonald plan are disclosed with the greatest clearness by the extremely well-informed Geneva Franco-Polish paper *Journal de Nacion*, on April 1st. Touching on the fourth section of the four-power pact, which was published in the French press, stating that the powers undertake to carry on a joint line of policy in all European and non-European questions, the paper states:

"*We admit that we see only one possibility of carrying on this general line of conduct, and that is an anti-Soviet crusade.* Hitler and Papen have been preaching it for a long time. . . . In Britain, Deterding and Beaverbrook are advocates of this crusade. . . . We admit that if Article 4 has any meaning at all, we cannot give it any other likely explanation."

Thus the significance of the Mussolini-MacDonald plan consists firstly in the revival of the plan of forming a united anti-Soviet bloc, in a new form, secondly in a serious enlargement of the revisionist group of powers in Europe by attracting Britain to it, and thirdly in the placing on the order of the day in international politics the question of the revision of the post-Versailles boundaries.

In the bourgeois press some facts from behind the scenes have already penetrated as to the many negotiations in Rome between Mussolini and MacDonald, and also as to the negotiations between Great Britain and France. From this mass of information, sometimes representing the obvious result of journalist combinations, we can obtain some very obvious preliminary elements of the plan of the four-power pact. It evidently amounts to the following. In principle, the four great powers must recognize the necessity of revising frontiers. The inclusion of France in the pact and the establishing of a general line of action of the great powers must lead to the limitation of the freedom of France and split it away from Poland and the Little Entente, isolate the latter and compel them to make territorial concessions to Germany, Hungary and Italy. On the basis of these concessions a temporary elimination of imperialist antagonisms and the formation of an anti-Soviet bloc must take place. This character of the four-power pact is well understood by the Polish official *Polish Gazette*, which wrote that the project is based on the following four principles:

1) "Intervention against other countries, because it is necessary to conclude pacts so as to make mutual concessions.

2) "Compulsion, because if this were not the case the decisions of the four gentlemen who represent four governments would not be of any significance for the world which the pact wants to save.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

3) "The pact must further be based on the deprival of freedom of action of some of those participating in it.

4) "It must be based on the limiting of the rights of other states."

The diplomatic language of the *Polish Gazette* discloses the imperialist plans of the initiators of the pact with the greatest clarity.

As for the real proposals for the revision of boundaries, they evidently amount to the plan of taking the Corridor from Poland and giving it to Germany, in which case Poland must be compensated at the outset by giving it Lithuania with Memel port. The boundaries of Czecho-Slovakia must be "rectified" for the benefit of Hungary and the latter must receive part of Transylvania (Rumania) inhabited by Hungarians, etc. For that matter, the plans of some of the revisionist countries do not stop here. Thus, Germany also wants the return of Upper Silesia and the Austrian Anschluss, while Italy wants the separation of Horvatia and Slovenia from Jugo-Slavia and the transfer of some of the French North African colonies and Near Eastern colonies to her (Tunis, Syria).

Such are the plans of the imperialists. But it is one thing to make plans and another to carry them out. The revisionist strivings of Mussolini go much further than the policy of British imperialism will allow. Italian Fascism is directing them not only against the allies of France but against France itself. The rejection of the idea of enlarging the bloc of leading powers by including the U.S.S.R. and the U.S.A. in it has the aim of isolating France in this bloc and not allowing the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. into the bloc, the position of which on all these questions may conflict with the Italian plans. On the other hand, Italy wants to limit the revision of the treaties in its own interests—Italian Fascism is against the "anschluss" of Austria and Germany, because this would strengthen the position of Germany in the Balkans and would bring Germany nearer to the Balkans and the Near-Eastern markets, where Germany and Italy meet as competitors. Therefore, Italian Fascism supports the Dolfuss group in Austria and the Heimwehr wing of Fascism as contrasted to the National-Socialists, who support their Austrian comrades in their strivings for an Anschluss.

At the same time, Britain will not go so far against France as Italy wishes. The interests of British imperialism are not limited to a narrow circle of purely European contradictions. British imperialism is an imperialism on a world scale and its main contradictions are not in Europe but against America, particularly in the Far East. Therefore Britain cannot drive France from itself. France is necessary to it for its big imperialist combinations. Therefore Britain is prepared to make a compromise with France on

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

questions of European policy, which has already made itself felt in the vacillations of Great Britain in connection with the resistance of France to the Mussolini-MacDonald plan. Therefore we can speak of a big zig-zag of Britain in the direction of the revisionist group of powers, but not the inclusion of Britain in it.

The project of the four-power pact was met with sharp hostility in the countries of the French military bloc. France itself does not want to weaken its military allies in the interest of satisfying the imperialist demands of Germany and Italy. The Little Entente and Poland opposed these plans still more definitely. They were to have given up their territory to Germany, Hungary, etc., strengthening their rivals and weakening their own position, their power, their role in Central Europe. Therefore they demand to be included in the system of the four power pact and that the revisionist side of the plan be abandoned. Otherwise they will disrupt this project. The countries of the French military alliance are not at all against the uniting forces of capitalism against the U.S.S.R., but they demand as a preliminary condition a guarantee against Germany, that it will not attack their integrity and independence. They are not at all prepared to make sacrifices, especially territorially, on the promise of doubtful compensation (dividing the skin of the Russian bear which has yet to be killed). Let others bear these sacrifices, let Germany, Hungary, etc., subordinate their interests to the general interests of world capitalism. Let them await the satisfaction of their claims till it is possible to divide up the skin of the bear.

But besides all these, the leading politicians of these countries are convinced that if Germany is given the possibility of arming and mobilizing its army, this will put the existence of their countries under the blows of German imperialism. Everyone knows the annexationist plans of Rosenberg and Hitler towards the Baltic countries and everyone remembers the annexationist policy of Germany in 1917-18 in these countries which was most clearly expressed in the Brest peace treaty. In this respect, very characteristic are the statements of the Latvian politicians, e.g., the prominent Social-Democrat, Zelens, who openly points out that the coming of Hitler to power has created a direct menace to the independence of Latvia. Still more clearly are the prospects of the realization of the plans of MacDonald-Mussolini by the well known Polish bourgeois National-Democratic paper, *A.B.C.* Criticising the position of the Ukrainian bourgeois nationalists who demand the participation of Poland together with Germany in the anti-Soviet bloc, *A.B.C.* writes:

> "This is the essence of the question. Ukraine already sees the big anti-Soviet front of the Western governments, of course under

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

> the leadership of Hitler, so that Poland would bow gracefully to Hitler who has to march to the East over the corpse of Poland."

All this explains why the Mussolini-MacDonald plan has not brought about accord but a sharpening of the contradictions in the camp of the imperialists, between the countries with revisionist tendencies and the countries of the French military bloc. It was precisely this which induced Britain to retreat from the first plan of the four-power pact and agree to the French demands, which at present nullify the revisionist side of the plan. These hesitations of British diplomacy do not deprive the foreign policy of Britain of its anti-Soviet keenness. The organization of a big anti-Soviet bloc for war against the U.S.S.R. is a matter which requires lengthy preparations. At the present moment the British plans have a more limited aim—*to bring about the external-political isolation of the U.S.S.R. and not to permit the recognition of the U.S.S.R. which is expected from the U.S.A.* The consistent anti-Soviet action of British imperialism—the denouncement of the commercial agreement with the U.S.S.R., the anti-Soviet campaign in connection with the trial of wreckers in the U.S.S.R.—the British engineers of Metro-Vickers—and finally the passing of a bill putting an embargo on Soviet goods, has this very aim. It is very characteristic that these efforts coincide with the activity of Japanese diplomacy, which sent its prominent representative Matsuoka to Washington to influence the U.S.A. in abandoning the recognition of the U.S.S.R.

The British anti-Soviet plans meet with a favorable response from the ruling Fascist circles of Germany. Thus, the prominent Hugenberg specialist on foreign politics, Professor Freitag Loringhofen, writes in *Der Tag* on April 6:

> "The Anglo-Soviet conflict automatically increases the weight of Germany. In any case, it is necessary to have the will and successful tactics to utilise this position. . . . The sharpening of the conflict with Russia will very soon compel Britain to value the friendship of Germany."

The words of Freitag Loringhofen are those of the Commissar for Foreign Affairs of the National-Socialists, Alfred Rosenberg, who, in the *Volkischer Beobachter* on April 6th, assured Britain that it is first of all interested in friendly relations with the Hitler government in connection with the conflict with the U.S.S.R. Thus German fascism offers its anti-Soviet services to British imperialism quite openly. It is not surprising that Germany had a very favorable attitude to the four-power pact and bitterly opposed the French amendments to this plan. This anti-Soviet position of the ruling circles of Fascist Germany is still more emphasized by the meeting

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in Rome between Mussolini, the Austrian Chancellor Dolfuss and the German ministers Papen and Goering. Well informed bourgeois journals state that in Rome *Papen and Goering are forging plans for a new anti-Soviet "Holy Alliance."*

In turn, the U.S.A. is very greatly disturbed by the plans of Rome and London, which are striving to create a European bloc without and against the U.S.A. For this reason, the representative of the U.S.A., Norman Davis, recently visited Paris, where he openly supported the French opposition to the MacDonald-Mussolini plan. The Hoover proposal for the rapid calling of the Washington meeting of leading capitalist powers for the preparation of a world economic conference should also be partly regarded as a step directed against this plan.

On the whole, we see that the regular attempts of the imperialists to reach some arrangement among themselves on the subject of even the temporary elimination of the contradictions of the Versailles system, and the formation of a united anti-Soviet bloc have so far ended in failure. They have not led to a reduction of chaos in international relations and have not weakened the instability of imperialist groupings. Contradictions continue to sharpen and thus increase the danger of a new war. But these attempts have plainly shown the increase in the active anti-Soviet tendencies in the camp of imperialism.

The working class of the U.S.S.R. and the whole of the world proletariat must therefore attentively watch all the machinations of international imperialism, no matter what European capital they take place in. In this connection it is further necessary to point out the *disgraceful conduct of international social-democracy. Faced with the growing war danger in Europe it is very plain that the social-democrats of all countries are preparing a new August 4th.* In Germany the social-democratic leaders have long since crawled on their bellies before the Fascist government and even recalled Wels from the Executive Committee of the Second International.

In France, the Socialists, headed by Leon Blum, are making gestures against fascism and against militarism . . . in Germany, but this is only the reverse side of their collaboration with the French bourgeoisie in the defense of the Versailles system. In France we have even now, in reality, a united front from Poincare to Leon Blum, just as in Germany we have a united front from Hitler to Wels. In Poland the P.P.S. openly announces its support of the Fascist government in case of war against Germany. Finally, in Latvia the social-democrat, Zelens, calls for a military alliance with Poland. Only the Communist Parties carry on a struggle

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

against imperialist war and against intervention in the U.S.S.R. Only they, in case of war or intervention, will use every effort to turn imperialist war into civil war in the shortest possible time. For success in this matter they must increase tenfold their exposure of the social-democratic parties, which are even now stating their readiness to repeat their treacherous policy of August 4th.

"Imperialism is the highest stage in the development of capitalism, one that has been reached only in the twentieth century. Capitalism began to feel cramped within the old national states, without the formation of which it could not overthrow feudalism. Capitalism has brought about such economic concentration that entire branches of industry are in the hands of syndicates, trusts, or corporations of billionaires; almost the entire globe has been parceled out among the "giants of capital", either in the form of colonies, or through the entangling of foreign countries by thousands of threads of financial exploitation. Free trade and competition have been superceded by tendencies towards monopoly, towards seizure of lands for the investment of capital, for the export of raw materials, etc. Capitalism, formerly a liberator of nations, has now, in its imperialist stage, become the greatest oppressor of nations. Formerly progressive it has become a reactionary force. It has developed the productive forces to such an extent that humanity must either pass over to Socialism, or for years, nay, decades, witness armed conflicts of the "great" nations for an artificial maintenance of capitalism by means of colonies, monopolies, privileges, and all sorts of national oppression."—Lenin.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Veterans and the United Front

By E. LEVIN

IN the special session of Congress, which has just recently adjourned, we can see the bourgeoisie organizing its "legal" program in its attempt to solve the crisis by further lowering the conditions and standards of living of the masses, and making preparations for war. This can be seen in the passing at the opening of the special session of Congress of the Economy Bill and in all the measures adopted by the Roosevelt administration, including the Industrial Recovery Act.

The Economy Bill is officially known as the "Act to Maintain the Credit of the United States Government." Its immediate objective was to cut $450,000,000 from the budget. This cut affects about 1,000,000 World War veterans and Spanish-American War veterans, their widows and other dependents.

However, the mass struggles of the veterans against this cut developed sufficient mass pressure to challenge, even if temporarily, the Roosevelt administration in its head-on attack on the standards of living of the veterans. The power of this mass pressure is indicated in the last day struggles in Congress—in both houses—when attempts were made to modify to some extent the powers granted President Roosevelt in the Economy Bill, and to reduce the amount of the cut in certain classifications of disabled veterans.

How was this power created? In the Veterans Rank and File Convention, held in Washington May 12-19, the 3,000 veteran delegates declared their unity with the struggle of the unemployed and farmers. The militant struggles of the farmers, the strikes of the workers, the united action of the unemployed in their struggles for immediate relief and unemployment insurance, the struggle against war, will now have in their ranks the support of the veterans in their struggle directed against the government itself.

This proposed unity caused a sharp reaction within the ranks of the bourgeoisie, who felt that efforts must be made to prevent this unity, to pacify the veterans. This struggle of the veterans and the reaction of the bourgeosie at the same time created a deeper and more active interest in the veterans' movement in the ranks of revolutionary, militant and class conscious sections of the masses.

What relationship has this struggle with the struggles of the masses for immediate relief and for the actual realization of social

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and unemployment insurance at the expense of the government and the bosses? How can these masses of veterans be brought more closely into the main struggle of the masses as a whole and be made to become an integral part of these struggles? What role can the veterans play in the struggle against the now feverish preparations for war and attack against the Soviet Union?

This article will analyze these so that:

1) The methods of organization and the tasks of the revolutionary sections of the veterans, the class conscious, the militant and honest elements of the rank and file of the veterans will be made more clear in order that the independent leadership of these masses can be developed; and

2) So that unity of the veterans with the struggles of the unemployed, the workers in shops and factories, the farmers, can be more effectively secured.

WHO ARE THE VETERANS?

Based on the 1930 census, one out of every five of the male population, averaging the age of 40 (this is the average age of the veteran) is a veteran. One out of every ten of the male population above the age of 21 is a veteran. The Conscription Law of 1917 reached deep into every village, town and city of the United States and its colonies. At least 15,000,000 of the population are affected by any attack against the security and welfare of the veterans. The veterans include every strata of the population: small shop-keepers, intellectuals, technicians, farmers and workers in shops and factories. The 20,000 or more who made up the Bonus March of 1932 was a clear cross-section of the veterans, and incidentally indicated the mood of the masses for action and struggle.

In the struggles of the veterans we find large sections of the petty bourgeoisie and backward workers objectively attacking capital. These elements must be guided in these struggles by the advanced sections of the workers. Lenin has clearly pointed out the importance of the struggles of such sections of the masses and their relation to the struggle against capitalism in his article, "Summary of the Discussion on Self-Determination":

> "Socialist revolution in Europe (and we should like to add that this relates not only to Europe) *cannot* be anything but an outburst of mass struggles on the part of all and sundry oppressed and dissatisfied elements; parts of the petty bourgeoisie and backward workers will inevitably participate in it—without such participation mass struggle is *impossible*, just as any kind of revolution—and it is just as inevitable that these elements will bring into the movement their prejudices, reactionary fantasies, weaknesses and errors. But *objectively*, they will attack capital and the conscious vanguard of the revolution, the advanced proletariat, by expressing

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

this objective truth of the heterogeneous and many-voiced variegated and outwardly divided mass struggles, will be able to coordinate and direct it." (Italics Lenin's.)

THE DEMANDS OF THE VETERANS

The demands of the veterans in the form of pensions, compensation and allowances for themselves or their dependents, are insurance and protection forced from the government for the part the soldiers played in protecting the interests of finance and monopoly capital in their struggles for markets and control of the sources of raw material. This struggle dates back to the American Revolution. The soldiers of Valley Forge and the "embattled farmers of Lexington and Concord" demanded their back-pay for the part they were forced to take in expropriating the lands of King George and turning these over to the colonial slave and land owners. The "Pay March" of these veterans drove Congress from Philadelphia and marks the first organized mass pressure of the veterans to force payment of back-pay from the bourgeoisie. In the succeeding struggles of the veterans, a policy of pensions, regardless of the nature or cause of ailment or disability, was established for the veterans.

A careful comparison of these struggles with those of the masses in the periods of crisis which followed soon after the major wars of the United States shows how these run parallel to the struggles of the masses for relief from the effects of the crisis. The struggle of the "Shayites" after the American Revolution, the strikes of the masses and the rise of the farmers' movement after the Civil War, the strikes and the struggle against the effects of unemployment after the World War, and the intensified struggle of the masses against the effects of the present crisis—all of these periods show corresponding and parallel struggles of the veterans.

It was only during this crisis that the first steps in uniting these struggles were effected. The organization of the Workers Ex-Servicemen's League in 1930, with its demand of unity with the workers in their struggles, was the first organized attempt to bring the rank and file of the veterans into the main struggles of the masses. The Bonus March of 1932, and its acceleration through the call of the Workers Ex-Servicemen's League for a march to Washington for mass protest on June 8, 1932, was the next step in the revolt of the rank and file of the veterans from the influence of the government-controlled veteran organizations. The subsequent conference of the Rank and File in Cleveland, September 23-26, 1932, the formation of the Veterans National Liaison Committee in Washington, December 1932, and the Veterans' Rank and File Convention in Washington, May, 1933, established

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the first steps toward unity. The Convention passed a resolution against reforestation and adopted the following program:

1. Immediate Cash Payment of the Adjusted Service Certificates.

2. No cuts in pensions, disability compensation or allowances.

3. Immediate remedial relief for the unemployed and farmers.

STRATEGY OF THE BOURGEOISIE

It is the unity of the veterans with other sections of the masses that is feared most by the bourgeoisie. Soon after the Spanish-American War, and with the beginning of the World War, the bourgeoisie intensified its struggle against payment of pensions. It raised the cry of graft in pension legislation. Those demanding pensions were called racketeers and treasury raiders. This cry was sharpened with the declaration of war against Germany. The liberal press, the *Nation* and *New Republic* also supported this cry of Wall Street. There were to be no pensions after the World War.

Under the guise of the liberal phrases of Wilson, a new policy was adopted. The men were to carry insurance. The War Risk Insurance Act, which was passed in 1914 to protect cargoes and shipping engaged in supplying war material to the allied and central powers—protection for capital—was amended to include insurance policies for the enlisted men, premiums to be paid by the men. This insurance was compulsory. In addition to this, veterans with dependents were forced to allot at least $15 of their $30 a month pay to their dependents. The government contributed a small portion to the dependents of the soldiers. Over 5,000,000 policies were issued. After the war, the veterans were unable to keep up payments. Over 4,400,000 insurance policies have lapsed. The hundreds of millions of dollars paid by the soldiers reverted back to the United States Treasury. The bourgeoisie was determined that their profits from the World War would not be encroached upon by the demands of 4,000,000 for insurance and protection after the war.

Despite these precautions the period since the World War is marked by a series of conflicts between the rank and file veterans and the government with its controlled veteran organizations. The disillusionment which spread after the war reached large sections of the veterans. They returned home, broken in body, penniless, and without jobs. The success of the Russian Revolution had a very favorable influence on sections of the veterans. (Councils of Soldier and Sailor Deputies were formed, particularly on the Pacific Coast.) The general radicalization of the masses also had its effects on the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ranks of the veterans—all these led to new struggles of the veterans on a wider front than ever before.

VETERANS' STRUGGLES AFTER THE WAR

Immediately after Armistice Day, the American Legion was formed to suppress the discontent and disillusionment which had already shown itself in the trenches, and to put a check on any attempt of the veterans to carry on struggles for demands against the government. The government provided rehabilitation and vocational training for the veterans; but these did not stem the tide of dissatisfaction. By 1924 the government was forced to recognize in principle that the war-time pay of the soldiers should be adjusted. This adjusted pay is commonly known as the Bonus. Even in the adoption of this law, the method of the government to withhold benefits of the soldiers is clearly exposed. Each veteran was entitled to an average of $1,000; but the government provided that this was not to be paid until 1945. In 1930, the veterans finally forced the government to advance them 50 per cent or $500 on the amount due them. The government, however, charged 4½ per cent interest on this amount; thus, by 1945, the balance of $500 would be eaten up by the interest.

This struggle around the Bonus, however, was not the main strategy of the bourgeoisie. They were determined that the 4,000,000 veterans should not have any claims for disabilities. Out of the 1,000,000 applications of veterans who claimed injuries due directly to the war, only 500,000 were approved by the government. It was impossible for the veteran, even immediately after the war, to prove his injuries as caused directly by the war, due to the poor medical records. The pressure of the soldiers who suffered from nervous and tubercular diseases again forced the government to give them benefits under what is known as "Presumptive Cases." Later, those who could not prove their disabilities were due to the war forced the government to grant payments known as "Disability Allowances," and which are generally characterized by the enemies of the veterans as non-service-connected disabilities. (This is a continuation of the past policy of granting pensions to veterans.) Additional pensions were given to widows and orphans of veterans; increased hospital and medical care were won. All these involved huge annual payments by the Federal government.

Ever since the World War, the bourgeoisie carried on intensive campaigns to wipe out these benefits. The Roosevelt Administration, under its pledge to Wall Street to balance the budget, assured finance capital that the Bonus would not be paid. The Veterans Administration carried on a steady program of removing service-connected disabled veterans. Over 174,000 of the original 500,000

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

were completely removed from any payments. The Republican, Democratic and Socialist Parties used almost the identical phrases in speaking of the disabled veterans. They all cried that the disabled veterans who received injuries directly connected with the war would not be affected. The liberal press echoed that cry. The United States Chamber of Commerce and the National Economy League were the organized instruments for carrying on this intensive campaign against the veterans. The leaders of the government controlled veterans' organizations supported this campaign and even recommended a cut in veterans' payments. The main attack was against those who could not prove their injuries as being service-connected and those who were injured since the war and were granted pensions under these laws.

The fight for the Bonus was shoved into the background. At the hearings before the Congressional Committee on Veterans' Legislation which was formed during the Hoover administration to investigate veterans' legislation, not one of the representatives of the major veteran's organizations raised the question of the Bonus. The Socialist Party, at first bitterly opposed to the bonus, modified its previous stand (*New Leader*, February 7, 1931): "It is probable that so great a bond issue and tax program as this sum would create certain financial difficulties and perhaps slow up business recovery." Norman Thomas now states he favors the bonus for the needy. In this he includes all the needy non-veterans as well. The Socialist Party still refuses, however, to recognize the Bonus as adjusted back pay. These same proposals were made by Hamilton Fish and others.

Even while the campaign to cut $450,000,000 from the veteran expenditures was being carried on, the Veterans Administration robbed the totally disabled veterans of the Disability Allowance class of over $50,000,000 by a simple process of rerating their cases. Ninety per cent of the neuro-psychiatric cases, under the presumptive classes, were removed because these cases were considered hereditary and not connected with the war. Veterans were deprived of hospitalization. Thousands of veterans already in hospitals were removed, and many of the hospitals were closed. Discrimination against Negro veterans became sharper. In the South, where facilities for veterans are limited and veterans were forced to travel long distances to hospitals where they would be admitted, these facilities for Negro veterans were limited even further.

With the combined support of the Republican, Democratic and Socialist parties, the leaders of the major veteran organizations, the Economy League, the Chamber of Commerce, the press, the radio and the church, the Democratic Congress passed the bill known as an "Act to Maintain the Credit of the United States Government."

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This provided for the $450,000,000 cut proposed by the Economy League. With one sweep of congressional action, the special session of Congress wiped out all the gains made by the veterans.

PROVISIONS OF THE ECONOMY BILL

The class character of the Bill is shown in the fact that Emergency Officers are exempt from any of the cuts under this law. Congress voted full power to President Roosevelt to put the cuts into effect. These cuts not only eliminate the 1,000,000 war veterans and their dependents who are now affected, but also the 3,000,000 veterans who would become eligible to protection in the future.

The law originally provided for a cut of $450,000,000 from the budget. The amendments to the Economy Bill which were passed during the last days of Congress limited the cut in service connected cases to 25 per cent and provided for a review of the "presumptive cases" (about 154,000 nerve and tubercular cases).

Under this law, the veteran has no appeal. The law reads as follows:

> "All decisions rendered by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs under the provisions of this title, or the regulations pursuant thereto, shall be final and conclusive on all questions of law and fact, and no other official or court of the United States shall have jurisdiction to review by mandamus or otherwise any such decision."

Wide discontent is already felt within the ranks of the veterans, and in some sections the Economy Bill is called the "suicide law" due to the number of veterans that are actually committing suicide because they will be deprived of their only means of support.

THE COUNTER OFFENSIVE

With the sharpened development of the crisis, militancy and radicalization of the veterans took place alongside of the upsurge of the masses. In mass demonstrations of the Communist youth, Legion members who were deputized as special officers refused to attack the revolutionary youth. The rank and file of a Legion post in Vermont protested sharply against the use of the militia against strikers. In the mass demonstrations of the unemployed, in the united front May Day activities, large sections of veterans participated.

Within the American Legion and other reactionary veteran organizations, the rank and file are in revolt. The pressure of the rank and file at the 1932 Convention forced the Legion to pass a resolution for the immediate payment of the Bonus. After the passage of the Economy Bill, National Commander Johnson of the American Legion called on the various posts to support their "Com-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mander-in Chief," President Roosevelt. The reaction against the National Commander of the American Legion immediately showed itself. State Departments of the American Legion revoked the charters of posts which supported the National Commander of their own organization. Similar discontent is brewing inside the other veteran organizations. These indicate the possibilities for winning over sections of the rank and file of the veterans who are within the government-controlled organizations.

VETERANS RANK AND FILE CONVENTION

The Convention of the Rank and File, held in Washington, D. C. and Camp Hunt, Va., May 12-19, attended by 3,000 delegates from all of the 48 States and several of the colonies, is the beginning of an organized movement of the veterans to build their own independent leadership and for unity with the masses. In addition to passing the three-point program and opposing reforestation, the Convention accepted a program based upon daily struggles for the formation of united action of the rank and file within the veteran movement, and for unity with the masses.

In the preparations for the Convention, conducted by the Veterans National Liaison Committee, and during the Convention, positive gains were made in the breakdown of discrimination against the Negroes and the attempt to divide the ranks of the veterans by excluding veterans because they belonged to a militant veterans' organization, or because of their political opinions, as members of the Communist Party. The bourgeoisie again carried on a steady campaign to divide the ranks of the veterans, just as they did in the last Bonus March. At the hearings before the Joint Congressional Committee on Veterans' Affairs, two members of the Veterans National Liaison Committee, who were enrolled Democrats, although only visitors at these hearings, protested against the attack that was being made to characterize the Veterans' National Liaison Committee as a Communist Committee. As a result of this protest, the United States Senate pointed out that an injustice was committed against the Veterans' National Liaison Committee, and in fact stated that Communists had as much right on veteran committees as veterans with other political beliefs.

After the government, as a result of the mass pressure of the veterans, entered into agreement for the veterans to conduct a convention by providing facilities for same, including food and shelter, a second attempt was made in Washington to divide the veterans. The cry of "Reds" was raised by a government supported group of veterans who called themselves the "right wing." Communist Party members on the committee, with the support of the veterans who had already arrived, agreed to resign in order to prevent the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

isolation of the militant section of the veterans. At the same time, the "right wing" leadership was exposed as agents of the enemies of the veterans, when they were defeated on their opposition to the three-point program, and in their support of reforestation.

The rank and file of the Convention then definitely showed that there would be no discrimination on account of political opinion by voting back into the committee the two Communist members who had resigned—Comrades Levin and Hickerson. This unity within the ranks of the veterans was further shown by the approval with which Comrade James W. Ford, Vice-Presidential candidate for the Communist Party, and a Negro war veteran, was received when he spoke on the last day of the Convention.

In spite of the influence of the demagogy of Roosevelt in giving the various concessions to the veterans, the Convention Committee showed a distinct and sharp militancy in refusing to permit the Veterans Bureau or any government agency to interfere with the conduct of the Camp and the Convention.

This Convention is the latest step in the process of organizing the rank and file of the veterans for their immediate demands and for drawing them into the main struggles of the masses.

ADDITIONAL FASCIST ORGANIZATIONS

The government does not rely only on its main organization basis, the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars and the Disabled American Veterans; but builds new reactionary groups from rank and file of the veterans. While the main bodies of the B.E.F. and Khaki Shirts were driven from their role of fascist groups by the pressure of the rank and file, new groups were developed which are even more outspoken as fascist groups: Waters, after being discredited, formed "The American Nationalists," with the guidance of Count Kurt Luedecker, Nazi representative in Washington, and several members of Congress. Waters stated his organization would become active if President Roosevelt needed support in carrying through his program. In Philadelphia, an independent group of Khaki Shirts was given the use of an old church in which they drill with clubs and lead pipes. Recently, these were used to break up Communist Party meetings. The "opposition" at the last Convention of the Rank and File are forming a group known as the "Order of '76."

ROLE OF THE PARTY

The Communist Party is the only party that supported fully the demands of the veterans. Immediately after the use of the troops on "Bloody Thursday" and the murder of Hushka and Carlson by the Glassford police in the Bonus March of 1932, the Party

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pointed out and warned the veterans that the main attack will be against their pensions, compensation and allowances. The Communist Party put forward the necessity for unity in the ranks of the veterans and the need for their support of the masses against hunger and starvation. The revolutionary press was the only press supporting the veterans. In the election campaigns of 1930, support of the veterans was one of the planks of the Communist Party. Groups of veterans, and the Workers Ex-Servicemen's League supported the platform of the C.P., and, as in the case of New Brunswick, on this basis broke down the attack of organized fascist groups, established the right of the Party to hold its election campaign. In Portland, Oregon, a candidate of the C. P. and an active member of the W.E.S.L., and the Disabled American Veterans, was given the floor at bourgeois election campaign meetings of veterans through the organized efforts of rank and file veterans present at these meetings.

However, in spite of the fact that the Veterans' National Liaison Committee had on it members of the Communist Party; in spite of the fact that the Daily Worker published its program and reached militant contacts among the veterans, very little organizational effort was made to support the veterans in their recent march to Washington. Only last moment announcements showed an awakening in support of the veterans. In the recent May Day demonstrations, the slogan for support of the veterans was included only after its omission was noted by comrades in the work. It was not felt as one of the demands of the united front.

The rank and file of the veterans, with the support of the masses, have been able to break down the attempts to use them as organized groups against the masses. The bourgeoisie will make every effort to form new groups to divide the ranks of the veterans. Unless the rank and file of the veterans will organize to carry on daily struggles around the program of the Rank and File Convention; unless there is more conscious and organized support from the militant section of the masses, it will not be possible to break down the efforts of the bourgeoisie to win over sections of the rank and file of the veterans and use them against the masses as a whole.

MASS PRESSURE GAINS RESULTS

In spite of the shortcomings and weaknesses within the ranks of the veterans' movement, the policy of using mass pressure as the basis of struggle has netted concrete and tangible results for the veterans. In New York City and other centers where the veterans carried on daily struggles for relief, their conditions have been improved. As a result of the 1932 Bonus March, over 400,000 vet-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

erans who had not yet borrowed on their adjusted service certificates were able to obtain on an average about $500 each. The modification of the Economy Bill in reducing the cut of the veterans from $450,000,000 to about $380,000,000 (a net saving of about $70,000,000) and the provision for a review of the presumptive cases, come directly as a result of the mass pressure of the veterans created by the recent convention of the rank and file veterans.

STRUGGLE AGAINST WAR

The attack on the veterans' pensions is part of the war preparations. They are removing all the past war debts through the Economy Bill, so that they will have less to pay after the next war. The Economy Bill wipes out all of the indebtedness to the soldiers of the Spanish American War, Boxer Uprising, Philippine Insurrection and the World War.

Finance and industrial capital gathered in their profits. War industries received additional millions in profits in the form of refunds and adjustments made on their war contracts with the government. They even received millions in interest because of time that elapsed in the payment of these additional sums. The officers of the last war are protected. New reserve officers are trained to a high degree of efficiency. The heads of the World War Labor Board are again being placed at the head of the Roosevelt commissions organized through the "Recovery Act." A new army, composed of 250,000 youths in the reforestation camps is now being trained for the next war.

The veterans, militant and fighting for their daily needs, can be one of the main sources of the masses for the struggle against war. Through their unity with the masses, they can win over large sections for struggle against war.

CONCLUSIONS

The struggle of the veterans for their pensions and for their back pay—the bonus—must now be recognized as part of the struggle of the masses for immediate relief and unemployment insurance. The growth of the veterans' movement should be developed in shops and factories as well as in the congressional and residential districts. The veterans must now become an integral part of the struggle of the masses for immediate relief, in the struggles of the farmers and in the daily struggle against war.

The basis upon which the rank and file of the veterans can unite their struggles, develop independent leadership among the veterans, strengthen their organizational forms, must be on the daily mass struggle for immediate relief and struggle against the Roosevelt government. Demonstrations should be held before Veteran Bu-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

reaus, homes of congressmen, before home relief bureaus, State Legislatures, etc. In all these demonstrations there should be full support by the masses as a whole. At the same time the veterans must give active and full support to the masses in their struggle for immediate relief and unemployment insurance. The veterans have the immediate task of developing strong opposition groups in the government controlled veterans' organizations to win over the rank and file of these organizations. The millions of unattached veterans—those who belong to no organization—should form themselves into rank and file committees in their congressional districts, neighborhoods, in their place of occupation, etc. The Workers Ex-Servicemen's League must broaden its work and break down many of its sectarian tendencies in order that it may continue to be a more effective mass organization of the veterans.

A militant movement among the veterans is now on the upswing. The rank and file of the veterans is beginning to see more clearly their common objective with the rest of the masses. This first step in the struggle has now been achieved. The next stage—the consolidation of the veterans and the unification of the veterans in common struggle with the rest of the masses are the next tasks not only of the veterans, but of the revolutionary, militant and class-conscious sections of the masses.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Soviet Union Fights for Peace

By A. A. HELLER

"The basis of the policy of our Government, of our foreign policy, is the policy of peace. The struggle for peace, the struggle against new wars, the unmasking of all steps for the preparation of a new war, the unmasking of steps, which under the banner of pacifism cover actual war preparations, this is our task.

"We do not wish to be either a hammer for the weak peoples, nor an anvil for the strong. We wish neither the one nor the other. We are for peace."—Stalin.

THE further sharpening of the antagonisms between the imperialist powers in the struggle for markets is being clearly demonstrated at the Economic Conference now in session in London. These struggles are rapidly leading to an armed conflict. "It is only the firm peace policy pursued by the U.S.S.R. and the fears the bourgeoisie entertain of the prospects of imperialist war being converted into civil war and colonial uprisings, that restrain them from slipping into war and intervention." (Thesis of the Twelfth Plenum of the E.C.C.I.)

Speaking of the economic warfare which is the condition of the capitalist world today, Nicholas Roosevelt, former Minister to Hungary and son of Theodore Roosevelt, in an article in the *New York Times* June 25, says: "The result of this economic warfare is lowered standards of living and increased unemployment and suffering. This, in turn, threatens social upheavals . . ." This fear of "social upheavals" does not stop the capitalist class from intensifying its attack upon the living standards of the masses. It is carrying on a relentless war on the workers and farmers.

This war finds expression in the increasing use of repressive measures and terror at home, and in tactics of lying and deception abroad. Capitalist spokesmen profess their devotion to peace, stage disarmament conferences, sign Kellogg pacts and non-aggression treaties, while war, both military and economic, is rampant in the capitalist world, while the burden of armaments is growing, while preparations for war on the Soviet Union are being carried on behind the curtain of peace conferences.

In its war on the workers at home, in its war preparations abroad, the capitalist class is actively aided by the reactionary labor leaders and the social fascists, who offer their cooperation to the capitalist governments in order to prevent the suffering of the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

masses from breaking through in "social upheaval", in order to disunite the workers and break their resistance. These misleaders of labor are among the worst enemies of the Soviet Union, shameless purveyors of lies and calumnies against the Soviet Government.

But the country where the workers rule, the country where the workers and collective farmers are heroically building Socialism is not to be misled by capitalist deception or social fascists' attacks. This country, the U.S.S.R., stands for peace among nations, against economic warfare and imperialist aggression. It has given ample proof during the fifteen years of its existence, by word and deed, of its sincere peace policy, of its readiness to disarm, of its willingness to subscribe to economic co-operation.

In accord with the Soviet Government's policy of peace, Litvinov, Commissar of Foreign Affairs of the Soviet Union, proposed to the World Economic Conference "a world pact of economic non-aggression, looking toward the abolition of all weapons of economic warfare." Sixteen months earlier, in Geneva, Litvinov proposed total and general disarmament, as the only way to create security against war. In offering this proposal, Litvinov said:

> "The political and economic differences existing between various States which have become considerably intensified since the Great War and owing to the crisis, are inevitably and rapidly leading to a new armed conflict between nations. In these circumstances the task of the hour is not the repetition of any attempt to achieve the reduction of armaments or war budgets, the realization of which is bound to come up against tremendous obstacles, but the actual prevention of war, through the creation of effective security against war. This task can only be carried out by means of total and general disarmament.
>
> "The sole aim of the Soviet Government is the building up of Socialism on the territory of the Soviet Union, and in the face of the successful accomplishment of the first Five Year Plan, of colossal achievements in every sphere of economic life . . . the Soviet Union requires neither the increase of territory, nor interference in the affairs of other nations, to achieve its aim, and could therefore do without army, navy, military aviation and all other forms of armed forces. It does, however, require the assurance that there will be no attempts against Soviet territory either and that other States will not interfere in its internal affairs, and that its peaceful economic construction will not be tampered with from without. It will only feel this assurance if other States also agree to give up their armed forces."

The proposals of total disarmament and economic non-aggression are a direct and logical result of the determined peace policy of the Soviet Union. This policy was proclaimed in 1917 and pursued steadfastly to this day. Despite open aggression and many acts of provocation during this period, the Soviet Union stubbornly

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

maintained its position: "Our policy is of peace and strengthening of trading relations with all countries. . . . We do not want a single foot of foreign territory; but we shall not give up a single inch of our own." (Stalin)

From the first declaration of its peace policy, at the Second All-Russian Congress of Soviets on November 8, 1917, to the present time, the Soviet Government has not relaxed its efforts to promote the cause of universal peace. At that momentous Congress the Soviet Government invited "all belligerent nations and their governments to begin immediate negotiations for a just and democratic peace." But this invitation was scorned by the capitalist governments then at war.

The following year, when the Soviet Government was fighting for its very existence against the white bands and the Czecho-Slovaks, the Allied Governments—England, France, the United States, together with Poland and Japan, launched an intervention campaign in the hope of crushing the Republic of the workers and peasants. In June 1918, British troops occupied Murmansk, while American troops landed at Vladivostok and Archangel three months later, and French warships arrived in Odessa. British military forces also invaded the Caucasus and together with the Social Revolutionaries and Mensheviks then ruling there, took part in the murder of twenty-six Baku Commissars. The intervention failed; the foreign armies were repulsed from Soviet soil during 1920. The white bands were defeated; peace with Poland was signed in March, 1921. Soviet territory was finally cleared of fighting armies and the Soviet Government could turn its attention to the restoration of the country.

But warfare—economic or military—is an accepted weapon of capitalist States. The Soviet Government succeeded in breaking through the economic blockade which was organized by the Allies—first by negotiating peace and trade agreements with its Baltic neighbors—Finland, Esthonia, Latvia and Lithuania during 1920, then in March 1921, by concluding a trade agreement with Great Britain. The Soviet State needed security from foreign aggression, whether economic or military, in order to proceed with its program of Socialist construction. But its desire for peace was never dictated by its own needs. The interests of a workers' State are the interests of the oppressed toilers the world over. In fighting for peace for itself, the Soviet Union fights for world peace. Because of this, the peace policy of the Soviet Union is an essential part of its program, adhered to persistently for over fifteen years.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The first condition of a sincere policy of peace is to disarm, to throw away all the instruments of war, to rid the world of munition makers and war mongers. Thus the Soviet Union was the first power to propose total disarmament, and offered to disband its army and scrap its military equipment, if the other powers would do likewise. A proposal for total disarmament was made by the Soviet delegation at the Geneva Conference in 1922. Since then whenever occasion arose, at every international conference, in the interest of universal peace, the Soviet Government repeated its offer of total disarmament. And it expressed its willingness to co-operate on a lesser program—a partial reduction of armaments. As Litvinov told the Geneva Conference, "Our delegation is ready to discuss any proposal tending to reduce armaments";but, he warned the Conference, "*limitation of armaments cannot be expected to prevent the outbreak of new wars.*"

The Central Executive Committee of the Soviet Union, on receiving the report of the Soviet delegation to the Fifth Session of the Preparatory Disarmament Conference in April, 1928, passed a resolution which clearly stated the position of the Soviet Government toward peace and disarmament. This resolution reads in part:

> "The Central Executive Committee of the U.S.S.R. pronouncing once more before the whole world the unalterable aspirations of the people of the Soviet Union towards peaceful co-existence with all other nations, and the determination of the Soviet Government to exert all efforts for the complete and final displacement of war as a method of solving conflicts between States, proposes to the Presidium of the C.E.C. and the Council of People's Commissars of the U.S.S.R. to continue to adhere to the program of full disarmament, not neglecting the least opportunity of achieving if only partial and temporary positive results in this sphere."

This resolution is a far more direct and complete denunciation of war "as a method of solving conflicts between States" than the Kellogg Pact, which was adopted four months later at Paris. The Kellogg Pact was signed by 14 of the capitalist powers on August 27, 1928. The Soviet Government was not consulted in the preparation of the Pact, and only after it was adopted, was invited by the French government to give its adherence to it. Despite this attitude of the Powers and despite the innocuousness of the Kellogg Pact, the Soviet Government accepted it "inasmuch as the Paris Pact places objectively certain obligations upon the Powers before public opinion and offers the Soviet Government a new opportunity to present to all the signatories of the Pact the question which is most important in the matter of peace—the question of disarmament, which is the only guarantee of prevention of war."

V. M. Molotov, Chairman of the Council of People's Com-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

missars confirmed the Soviet Union's policy of peace:

> "The Soviet Union has more than once shown, and is showing today, by its general international policy that the U.S.S.R. is the only true and, in fact, the only consistent fighter for peace.
>
> "Who, if not the Soviet Union, proposed at the Disarmament Conference at Geneva a pact stipulating complete disarmament of all countries? Who, if not the Soviet Union, proposed, after this project was rejected, a scheme of at least partial disarmament and especially the disarmament of the strongest imperialist powers and of those which are the greatest menace to peace? This policy of struggle for peace and for the exposure of all imperialist provocations of new wars the Soviet Union regarded and regards today as one of its chief tasks.
>
> "We all know that the Soviet Union also proposed an international agreement directed against economic aggression on the part of one country against another. In this act as well one cannot fail to see the Soviet Republic's consistency in the struggle for universal peace."

The Soviet Union accepted the Kellogg Pact as one of these steps. In order to extend the scope of the Pact, Litvinov, immediately after signing it, proposed to the Western neighbors of the Soviet Union to enter into an agreement among themselves, accepting the pact without waiting for the other countries to ratify it. After many efforts to bring the hostile countries together, the agreement was signed in Moscow, February 9, 1929, by Poland, Esthonia, Latvia, Rumania and the Soviet Union. The agreement is known as the Litvinov Moscow Protocol.

This agreement was followed by the conclusion of non-aggression pacts between the Soviet Government and several European countries, notably the one with Poland in 1932 and with France, signed in November, 1932, and ratified in May. Similar pacts were proposed to all countries, Japan among others. Trading and peace agreements concluded with Persia, Turkey and Afghanistan in 1921, were later supplemented by non-aggression pacts; in the case of China, the first agreement was concluded in 1924 and a non-aggression pact entered into in 1932.

The value of such pacts and agreements is, as Litvinov frankly stated to the Geneva Conference, in the spirit they display:

> "We do not underrate the importance of international treaties and undertakings for peace . . . It (the Soviet Government) always proposed non-aggression pacts to all States. These pacts are a kind of acid test for making other States display their spirit, whether peaceful or the reverse. . . . In addition, *it must be admitted that the conclusion of a non-aggression pact increases the guilt of the aggressor in cases of disturbance of the peace. Such pacts cannot, however, be considered an actual guarantee against war.*"

While the Soviet Union succeeded, through unremitting efforts

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and at the cost of many sacrifices, in maintaining peace with the rest of the world, it has succeeded also in centering the world's attention on the question of disarmament, and the question of economic peace as conditions of universal peace. It was able to succeed in this much, because the Soviet workers consider the building of Socialism vastly more important than temporary setbacks, annoying interferences and provocative acts, directed against the Soviet Union by the imperialist powers. The Soviet Government promptly and determinedly resisted every act of provocation, but never allowed itself to be drawn into a fight which might have threatened the peace of the world. One such instance was the attack of the Chinese war lords on the Chinese Eastern Railway in 1929. This attack was instigated by the imperialists as a "general rehearsal for a second intervention"—to provoke the Soviet Union into war. But the attempt failed miserably. Secretary Stimson who tried to use this occasion for an admonition to the Soviet Government was properly rebuked by Litvinov, in a reply that has become world famous:

> "The Government of the Soviet Union declares that the Government of the United States has addressed to it its declaration at the moment, when between the Soviet and Mukden Governments an accord has been reached on a number of conditions and direct negotiations are being carried on which will permit the early solution of the Soviet-China conflict. In view of this circumstance, the address mentioned cannot but be regarded as unjustified pressure on the negotiations and consequently can in no way be considered a friendly act."

Provocations and attacks on the Soviet Union by the capitalist powers, since their expulsion from Soviet territory in 1920, have not ceased for one moment, assuming different forms at different periods; often as the result of concerted action on the part of several powers, at times carried out by one country alone, but always with the tacit support of other powers. Poland perpetrated many acts of provocation against the Soviet Union; also Finland and Rumania. The attitude of France, provocative in the extreme, at the head of anti-Soviet conspiracies for many years, has not changed with the recent signing of the non-aggression pact, even though it has veered in the direction of ostentatious "friendship." The United States Government still preserves its hostile attitude to the Soviet Union. Of all the great powers, it is the only one that has failed to enter into direct relations with the Soviet Government. The professions of the Roosevelt administration urging disarmament, an economic truce and universal peace are belied by the acts of the American government; the United States is strengthening its army and building more warships; it is introducing forced labor and open monopoly

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

control, and in the matter of peace, the present administration continues the tactics of its predecessors. The position of the United States government with regard to the Soviet Union is a standing menace to the peace of the world. It gives aid and comfort to all enemies of the Soviet Government and encourages all anti-Soviet forces in their campaigns against the Soviet Union.

In the government of Great Britain the Soviet Union has a bitter opponent. Every effort of the Soviet Government to promote peace is combated by the British die-hards. At the last Geneva Disarmament Conference, Sir John Simon opposed the acceptance of the Soviet definition of an aggressor, which was approved by the conference, on the ground that this was opposed to the "Anglo-Saxon idea." Evidently the "Anglo-Saxon idea" is to promote conflicts. While Great Britain was the first of the great powers to enter into a trading agreement with the Soviet Government in 1921, it has nevertheless pursued a road of perpetual conflict since. To cite a few of the highlights: In 1923 Lord Curzon presented an ultimatum to the Soviet Government. In 1924 the famous "Zinoviev letter" made its appearance. In 1927 the British police raided the office of Arcos, which led to a break of relations. These were resumed toward the end of 1929. But at this moment there is again a break in the commercial relations of the two countries. The trial of the British engineers in Moscow last April served as an excuse for the present break. By this method the British government hoped to succeed in hiding the spying activities of the British government through the condemned engineers. In addition to these direct conflicts Great Britain is taking part in every attack on the Soviet Union, in every war move against the Workers' Republic. In Europe or in Asia, as in the attack on the Chinese Eastern Railway in 1929, or the attacks of the Nanking Government two years earlier, or in the movement of warring tribes in Thibet at the present time, or in the war preparations of Japan, the hand of the British imperialists can be discerned. The same hand that promoted the Four Power Pact, recently signed at Rome —a war measure directed against the Soviet Union.

> "British capitalism always was and will be the most atrocious strangler of popular revolutions. Beginning with the French Revolution and ending with the Chinese Revolution, the English bourgeoisie always stood and continued to stand in the first ranks of destroyers of mankind's strivings for freedom."—(Stalin)

Germany of today, under the domination of the murderous bands of Hitler, is a direct menace to world peace and to the Soviet Union. Hitler may yet become the catspaw of the capitalist world in an

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

effort to crush the Soviet Union. Hitler's Minister of Economics, Hugenberg, held out a direct threat against the Soviet Union in his recent address before the World Economic Conference. He demanded that fascist Germany be permitted to expand toward the east, meaning the territory of the Soviet Union. Here Hugenberg repeated the offer previously made to the imperialist powers by Rosenberg, Hitler's chief lieutenant, to lead in a war against the U.S.S.R., and receive Soviet Ukraine, as Germany's share in the spoils. Realizing this danger the Soviet workers have redoubled their watchfulness; they will not permit themselves to be provoked into hasty action, they are continuing with greater energy the struggle for peace.

The campaign of conquest of the Japanese aggressors is far from completed. They would have carried their attack on Soviet soil before this if the Soviet Union had not demonstrated its strength, if the Soviet workers were to relax for a moment their watchfulness, their determination to resist war despite all provocations. Even now the Japanese command is seeking a pretext to start hostilities; Japanese troops are being moved north and concentrated along the Soviet borders; any day may see an open outbreak. But the Soviet Union does not want war; it will not permit the Japanese attack on the Chinese Eastern Railway, owned by the Soviet Government, to serve as a cause. For this reason it offered to sell the railway to Japan, preferring an amicable settlement to an armed conflict. To what extent are the European and American imperialists furthering Japan's aggression? The acid test of the capitalist powers' peace professions will be war or peace in the Far East. And the bitter economic war between the imperialist powers points to war against the Soviet Union as a means by which the imperialist powers will attempt to find a solution of the crisis.

In this brief summary it is impossible to give a complete record of all the acts of provocation perpetrated against the Soviet Union by the imperialist powers; describe in full the underlying hostility and the unceasing threats of the capitalists against the Soviet power, of dying capitalism against Socialism; nor present a full account of the fight the Soviet Union had and still has to wage in order to preserve peace. In their fight for peace, in their fight to build a Socialist society, the Soviet workers encountered the hostility not alone of the imperialists, but of their hirelings, the social fascists, as well. The leaders of the Socialist parties in every capitalist country, the labor bureaucrats, in their eagerness to serve capitalism, carry on a campaign of slander against the Soviet Republic, lie and defame the Soviet workers and participate in plots to overthrow the Soviet Government. The plotter Abramovitch, member of the Second International and friend of white guards, spreads on the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pages of the *New Leader* a series of attacks and calumnies against the Soviet Union. Norman Thomas, the darling of the capitalists, assails in the *New York Times*, June 18, "Communism with its ruthless dictatorship and denial of religious and civil liberty." Thomas, imitator of the British working-class betrayer, MacDonald, may well receive the support of the capitalist class, as defender of religious and civil liberties! The list of Socialist and labor misleaders in the United States, in Europe and Japan, is a long one. The working class of the world, the exploited and oppressed everywhere, will know how to judge these servants of capital.

The imperialist powers, despite all pacts and agreements, despite the lying professions of disarmament and economic truce, are continuing their mad race for armaments, their war preparations and plans for the attack on the Soviet Union. In the very real danger of a new war that is threatening the world, the struggle of the Soviet Union for peace, its efforts to expose the imperialists and war-mongers, must be brought home to the masses who will be the first sufferers in the catastrophe. The workers and farmers, the exploited of the world, must be aroused and mobilized to join with the Soviet workers and farmers in their fight against imperialist war. Lenin, with the penetrating foresight common to him, made a statement in 1918 which is applicable to the world situation today:

> "The political situation of the world has placed now as the question of the moment, the dictatorship of the proletariat; and all events of world politics concentrate around one central point, the fight of the world bourgeoisie against the Soviet Republic; unalterably grouped around the Soviet Republic are, on the one hand, Soviet movements of the advanced workers of all lands, and all the national movements for freedom of the colonial and oppressed peoples on the other; through their own bitter experience they become convinced that there is no salvation for them except in the victory of Soviet power over world imperialism."

The salvation of the world's disinherited is the work of themselves:

> "There is no such thing as a hopeless situation. Humanity has a way out. The class conscious, organized workers know that way. They must assemble the greatest possible mass forces in order to undertake the great step of saving humanity from the madness, the deliberate, cold-blooded 'common-sense' madness, the class-dictated, fatal, incorrigible madness of the present rulers of world policies." (Lunacharsky at the Geneva Conference.)

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Just Out!

In a NEW Popular Priced Editon

PROGRAM

of the

COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

This most important document of the Communist movement is now within the reach of every Communist and revolutionary worker.

96 pages. *GET YOUR COPY NOW* *Formerly 25c*

NOW ONLY 10c

●

Latest Authentic Pamphlets on the Situation in Germany

WHAT IS HAPPENING IN GERMANY—*Fritz Heckert* 3c
THE FIGHT FOR COMMUNISM IN GERMANY 1c
HITLER AND THE TRADE UNIONS 3c

Read Them! ***Spread Them!***

●

Are you selling and distributing these pamphlets on unemployment in your daily activities?

These little Penny and Two-Cent pamphlets are powerful weapons in building and strengthening Unemployed Councils, Block Committees, and for mobilizing for demonstrations and struggles for unemployment relief and insurance.

THE MARCH AGAINST HUNGER—*I. Amter* 1c
OUR CHILDREN CRY FOR BREAD—*Sadie Van Veen*...1c
HOW TO ORGANIZE AND CONDUCT UNITED ACTION FOR THE RIGHT TO LIVE—A Manual for Hunger Fighters—*H. Benjamin* 2c
MAKE THE DEMOCRATS KEEP THEIR PROMISES....2c
SHALL IT BE HUNGER DOLES OR UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE?—*H. Benjamin* 1c
THE JOBLESS NEGRO—*Elizabeth Lawson* 1c
THE HIGHWAY OF HUNGER—*Dave Doran* 1c

●

Order in Quantities From:

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Sta. D., New York City

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

FASCINATING! INSTRUCTIVE!

HOW THE OLD BOLSHEVIKS WORKED! THEIR OWN STORY!

"Bolshevik History" Library

BOLSHEVIKS ON TRIAL—S. *Tchernomordik* ..... .10
BOOK PUBLISHING UNDER TSARISM—M. S. *Kedrov* ..... .10
ESCAPE FROM THE GALLOWS—*Felix Kohn* ..... .10
PROVOCATEURS I HAVE KNOWN—C. *Bobrovskaya* ..... .10
THE STRIKE OF THE DREDGING FLEET, 1905 — *Peter Nikiforov* ..... .15
UNEMPLOYED COUNCILS IN ST. PETERSBURG IN 1906—*Sergei Malyshev* ..... .15
THE REVOLT OF THE ARMORED CRUISER "POTEMKIN"—*A. Kanatchikov* ..... .10
FROM THE FEBRUARY REVOLUTION TO THE OCTOBER REVOLUTION—*A. F. Ilyin Genevsky* ..... .25
BOLSHEVIK SMUGGLERS—S. *Shaumyan* ..... .10

"Brief Biography" Series

IVAN BABUSHKIN—Lenin's Friend—C. *Bobrovskaya* ..... .10
Y. M. SVERDLOV—First President of the Labor Republic—*C. Bobrovskaya* ..... .10
LIFE OF KAMO—The Life of a Great Revolutionist—*R. Oblenskaya* .10

No revolutionary worker can afford to be without these pamphlets!

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Sta. D, (50 East 13th St.) New York City

Read! *Subscribe!*

Daily Worker

Central Organ of the Workers Party U.S.A.

50 East 13th Street, New York, N. Y.

"The Only English Daily Working Class Newspaper in America"

Brings you the truth about all vital and dramatic developments in the class struggle in America and throughout the world.

SPECIAL CORRESPONDENCE FROM THE SOVIET UNION. The only authoritative news accounts and features of the life and accomplishments in the First Workers Republic.

Address All Subscriptions and Communications to:

DAILY WORKER, 35 East 12th Street, New York, N. Y.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES:

In Boros of Manhattan and Bronx, N.Y.C.:		In the Rest of the United States:	
One year	$9.00	One year	$6.00
Six months	5.00	Six months	3.50
Three months	3.00	Three months	2.00
One month	1.00	One month	.75

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED